DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 881 SP 017 303

AUTHOR Duke, Daniel L.; And Others
TITLE Teachers as School Decision Makers. Project Report No. 80-A7.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 101p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; *Individual Power; Policy Formation; Power Structure; Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Psychological Needs; *School Administration; Staff Development; *Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

School decision making opportunities available to teachers were identified, and possible reasons for the existence of so little teacher decision making authority in the public schools were explored. While there was some evidence that many teachers may not desire increased involvement, the question was raised of whether or not such involvement might be in their best interests. Teacher involvement was examined in nine areas: instructional coordination, curriculum development, professional development, evaluation, school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policy making. Analysis of the phases of decision making and the relationship between involvement and influence in the decision making processes suggested that teachers have more involvement than influence. The absence of teacher involvement was examined from the perspectives of psychology, political science, sociology, and organizational theory. It was concluded that each of the disciplines made valuable contributions to an understanding of teacher decision making at the school level, although none alone could provide a complete explanation for the current pattern of teacher involvement. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196881

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Project Report No. 80-A7

TEACHERS AS SCHOOL DECISION MAKERS*

Daniel L. Duke[1]
Beverly K. Showers[2]
Michael Imber[3]

May 1980

[1]This author is Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, Stanford University.

[2]This author is a doctoral student in the School of Education, Stanford University.

[3]This author is a doctoral student in the School of Education, Stanford University.

SP 017303

*This study was conducted as part of the Organizational Sociology Component of the Stanford Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance and was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education. The analyses and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance.

JAN 2 6 1981

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON
EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND GOVERNANCE

The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance is a Research and Development Center of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and is funded under the provisions of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Institute is administered through the School of Education at Stanford University and is located in the Center for Educational Research at Stanford (CERAS).

The Research activity of the Institute is divided into the following program areas: Finance and Economics; Politics; Law; Organizations; and History. In addition, there are a number of other projects and programs in the finance and governance area that are sponsored by private foundations and government agencies which are outside of the special R & D Center relationship with NIE.

Abstract

The authors identified school decision-making opportunities available to teachers, explored possible reasons for the existence of so little teacher decision-making authority in the public schools, and addressed the issue of the relationship between teacher involvement in school decision-making and productivity (student and teacher outcomes).

An ethical case, based on the concept of workplace democracy was made for greater teacher involvement in school decision making. While acknowledging some evidence that many teachers may not desire increased involvement, the authors raised the question of whether or not such involvement might be in their best interests.

In an extensive review of literature on teacher involvement in school decision making, teacher involvement was examined in nine areas--instructional coordination, curriculum development, professional development, evaluation, school improvement, personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policymaking. While there was evidence of some teacher involvement in all these areas, analysis of the phases of decision making and the relationship between involvement and influence in the decision making process suggested that teachers have more involvement than influence in school decision making.

The absence of teacher involvement was examined from the perspectives of psychology, political science, sociology and organizational theory. The authors concluded that each of these disciplines made valuable contributions to an understanding of teacher decision making at the school level, although none alone could provide a complete explanation for the current pattern of teacher involvement.

Finally, an argument was made for future research to investigate the relationship between teacher involvement in school decision making and productivity.

Teachers as School Decision Makers

> If there is a single school system in the United States, where there is an official and constitutional provision for submitting questions of method of discipline and teaching and questions of curriculum, textbooks, etc., to the discussion and decision of those actually engaged in the work of teaching, that fact has escaped my notice.
>
> John Dewey
> Elementary School Journal
> December 1903

Interest in teacher involvement in school decision making has been present at least since the early 1900's, when John Dewey wrote the passage above. One of the purposes of this study is to identify the decision making opportunities available to teachers. Since, as the upcoming discussion will show, teachers generally do not enjoy extensive decision making authority, a second purpose is to try and explain why this is so.

The position is taken at the outset that an ethical case can be made for greater teacher involvement in decision making. The authors are basically supportive of this case, though they are not oblivious to the problems that can arise from any effort to decentralize authority. At the conclusion, an effort is made to consider some of these potential negative by-products. The effort focuses on the relationship between teacher involvement in decision making and certain student and teacher outcomes.

The Context of the Study

For the past fifty years, social scientists, philosophers, and mathematicians have become increasingly interested in various aspects of the decision making process. Decision theoritsts have concerned themselves with analyzing the problem of individuals or groups that are required to make choices in the face of incomplete information concerning the consequences of rival alternatives. Whether their work is descriptive or as is more

commonly the case, normative, it has focused almost entirely on the rational decision maker. Most often the question has been: What choices would (or should) a rational person make?

Some psychologists, however, have recognized that people (and groups) do not always behave rationally. Therapists, in fact, have increasingly perceived the need to teach people to make decisions which are consistent with their own aims. Furthermore, it is clearly possible for individuals to be ignorant not only of the consequences of various choices but also of which consequences are in their own best interest. Thus, even rational people can fail to make the right choice.

As complicated as the decision making problems of individuals can be, those of organizations are all the more complex if only because they are made up of individuals who inevitably have conflicting interests. Political scientists have looked at the process of coalition formation within organizations in an attempt to understand how such conflicts are resolved. For their part, sociologists studying organizatioal theory have been concerned with the way in which structural aspects of organizations can imbue decision making power in certain individuals while denying it to others. They have looked at both formal and informal organizational factors which make certain individuals much more likely than others to participate meaningfully in decision making.

The present study takes the psychologist's and organizational theorist's perspective in looking at decision making among teachers in schools. It will argue that factors about the way in which schools are structured and managed have tended to inhibit teachers from participating extensively in the making of decisions. Moreover, while recognizing that there is some evidence that many teachers may not actively desire increased involvement

in organizational decision making, it holds that the question of whether or not such involvement is in their best interests is nevertheless open.

Whatever the view of teachers relative to shared decision making, it is clear that in recent years many other groups have been demanding the right to be involved in making choices which affect their lives. Consumer action groups, for example, have united to demand increased influence over various characteristics of the products they buy. Struggles to form unions by traditionally powerless groups of workers such as migrant farmers can be understood in part as an attempt to gain a fair share of the decision making pie. Family life has been a particularly active forum. Teenagers have demanded and received increased involvement in a number of types of decisions--from voting to personal health questions--from which they have traditionally been excluded, and many wives have been far less content than in the past to leave the decision making to their husbands.

In education, the past two decades have witnessed both official and grassroots demands for collaborative decision making and shared authority. For the first time, federal and state legislation allocating funds to schools have required the establishment of school site councils and local advisory boards to help determine how money will be spent. At the local level, alternative schools have been created by teachers, parents, and students frustrated by unresponsive school systems. These school site councils and alternative schools usually have entailed considerable shared decision making.

Typically, the rationale for attempts to decentralize the decision making process in education has rested on the notion that, ultimately, such a course would have a positive effect on the productivity of schools. That is, it has been posited that if various constituencies--teachers, parents

and/or students--assume a greater share of decision making involvement, students will reap certain benefits.

When teachers are the constituency, the position is usually based on two arguments. The first argument derives from the belief that a sound awareness of student needs is a prerequisite to effective educational decisions. It holds that by virtue of their daily contact with students, teachers are the only professionals who can accurately gauge the particular needs of students at a given school. Therefore, they have a unique contribution to make to the school decision making process.

The second argument is psychological in nature. It holds that people who are involved in making decisions will have a greater stake in those decisions than those who are not. Therefore, teachers who help make decisions will try harder to make those decisions work out well. If teachers try harder, students presumably will benefit.

Despite these arguments, however, it is clear that the notion that greater teacher involvement in decision making will lead to desirable student outcomes is by no means established. The question of possible relationships between teacher participation in decision making and various student outcomes, both positive and negative, will be considered in greater detail at the end of this study. For the present, it will only be noted that due to a lack of research, the issue remains open. In fact, it is our hope that researchers will give this question careful consideration in the near future.

Workplace Democracy

Despite the uncertainty concerning the exact relationship between participation and productivity, there is a much more fundamental reason for our interest in teacher involvement in decision making at this time.

Stated broadly, we believe that any employee group, teachers included, has a basic right to be involved in the decision making process of the organization for which they work. More specifically, we believe that it is imperative for teachers to gain a greater share of the authority to make decisions regarding their own work. In order to understand the justification for this belief, let us consider two analogies.

As has been mentioned, many women in recent years, have demanded increased involvement in the decision making processes of their families. No one, feminists included, has based this demand of the notion that families will run more efficiently or be more productive if decision making is collaborative (although we suspect that positive results will accrue). Rather, the argument has been that women should be involved in decisions affecting their families for the same reason that men should--because it is right. Similarly, on a much larger scale, the basic argument for a democratic form of government is not that democracy is more productive or efficient than other less collaborative forms of government, but rather that everyone has the right to be included in government.

When applied to workers, the viewpoint which these analogies support is called workplace democracy. It holds that the fact that workers agree to exchange their labor for remuneration does not in itself justify the assumption by their superiors of total control of that labor. In this view, workers, despite their agreement to participate in an organized process of production, cannot be treated purely as means to an end. They retain the right to collaborate on decisions which relate to the utilization of their own labor.

We believe that the case for workplace democracy is at least strong enough to merit serious consideration of ways in which it can be applied to teachers. To support this belief we find it useful to distinguish between two possible formulations of the principle of workplace democracy. The first

formulation, which we call the weak principle of workplace democracy, states: Workers have a right to control their own labor at least to the extent that production is not negatively affected. The second or strong principle goes further: Workers have a right to control their own labor even if productivity is negatively affected. Although many advocates of workplace democracy would support the strong principle, we will not insist on it here because we wish to avoid prolonged philosphical debate on the issue of workers' rights. Instead, we will be satisfied for the moment with the weak principle, which is much less controversial. We do not think that there is any reasonable case against the weak principle because any such case would call for a limitation of worker freedom which could not be justified by legitimate organizational goals. Furthermore, since the effect of increased teacher decision making involvement is currently unknown, even the weak principle is sufficiently strong to justify attempts to explore ways to increase the decision making involvement of teachers.

In fact, many scholars have concluded that increased workplace democracy usually leads to increased productivity. In a review of studies relating to this issue the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Work in America, 1973) found more than two dozen cases in which increased worker involvement in decision making had increased productivity and none in which productivity had declined. However, schools differ in a number of fundamenal ways from the industrial organizations in which these studies took place and no specific research relative to this question has been reported for schools. Again, we readily admit that whether this direct relationship between workplace democracy and productivity will obtain in schools is open to study.

Less controversial is the notion that workplace democracy is in the best interest of any group of workers. Blumberg (1969, p. 121) summarizes the

literature concerning the relationship between worker decision making power and job satisfaction as follows:

> There is scarcely a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced ...(by) a genuine increase in worker's decision-making power. Findings of such consistency, I submit, are rare in social research...The participative worker is an involved worker, for his job becomes an extension of himself and by his decisions he is creating his work, modifying and regulating it.

These consistent findings give credence to the contention that any worker begins to feel estranged from his or her work when separated from the process by which work-related decisions are made. Perhaps the most eloquent exposition of this view is made by Braverman in Labor and Monopoly Capital (1974). Braverman places special blame on excessive division of labor for the "degradation" of work in contemporary Western society and the "progressive alienation of the process of production from the worker." Scott (1966, p. 267) supports this view, noting that "a worker who performs the entire task will be more willing and better able to assume responsibility for the control of his performance than will the worker who carries out only a portion of the task and whose performance may in various ways be dependent on the work of others."

Pateman (1970, pp. 103-111) goes on to suggest that workplace democracy is in the best interests of a democratic society as well as individual workers. Rejecting the belief that ordinary people are not sufficiently interested to become involved in decision making, she contends that structural factors serve to discourage widespread participation in democratic societies. Pateman argues for workplace democracy (as well as the democratization of other sectors of society) on the grounds that citizens learn to participate in their government by practicing participation on the job, in school, at home, and elsewhere. She notes that (p. 46),

> People who have a sense of political efficacy are more likely to participate in politics than those in whom this feeling is lacking and it has also been found that underlying the sense of political efficacy is a sense of general, personal effectiveness, which involves self-confidence in one's dealings with the world.

Phrasing the same idea slightly differently, Almond and Verba (1965, pp. 271-272) maintain that,

> ...if in most social situations the individual finds himself subservient to some authority figure, it is likely that he will expect such an authority relationship in the political sphere. On the other hand, if outside the political sphere he has opportunities to participate in a wide range of social decisions, he will probably expect to be able to participate in political decisions as well. Furthermore, participation in non-political decision making may give one the skills needed to engage in political participation.

Levin (1978, pp. 61-70) indicates that strides toward the goal of workplace democracy are being made, particularly in Europe, China, and Cuba. He distinguishes between micro-political reforms ("changes in the internal decision-making of the work enterprise") and macro-political reforms ("modifications of the external or overall governance of the firm"). Among the reforms currently taking place around the world are the creation of autonomous work groups, worker councils, and employee-initiated ownership plans as well as provisions for worker representation on corporate boards. Levin cites the Israeli kibbutz and worker self-management schemes in Yugoslavia, China, and Cuba as further illustrations of situations in which workers make decisions about production and distribution.

In essence, then, there appears to be a growing awareness that workers in a variety of occupations should be directly involved in making work-related decisions. By virtue of possessing labor power, every worker deserves a voice in determining how that labor power will be used, in what kind of work setting, and under what conditions. This awareness forms the foundation of

the present inquiry into the actual and potential role of teachers as organizational decision makers.

Domains of Educational Decisions

As the authors have observed elsewhere (1978), there are four distinct domains of possible teacher involvement in decision making: classroom decisions, professional organization decisions, school system decisions, and single school decisions.

The domain of classroom decisions is the most frequent focus of studies of teacher decision making (Doyle, 1979; Shavelson, 1976; Shulman and Elstein, 1975). Decisions in this area involve instructional planning for particular students, selection of daily learning objectives, designation of rules governing student conduct in class, and evaluation of student performance. These decisions are distinguishable from those in other domains because (1) they tend to have a direct impact only on the individuals within a single classroom and (2) they require little coordination with persons outside the classroom. General agreement (Pellegrin, 1976, pp. 358-359) exists that individual teachers exercise considerable influence over classroom decision making, but some experts have questioned the desirability of this autonomy (National Institute of Education, 1975, pp. 8-9):

> The traditionally organized school does not give sufficient support to the classroom teacher's instructional role. In that school, the least supported or controlled decision is the decision on instructional strategy made by classroom personnel. Although the school, particularly the elementary school, has the appearance of a bureaucratic structure with the principal supervising the classroom teachers, analysis and research indicates that the classroom teacher is typically totally isolated in making important educational decisions.

Professional organization decisions, the second domain, pertain to the activities of teacher associations and unions as well as subject matter and other specialty groups. Until recently, control of teacher organizations often rested with non-teachers. In the last few decades, though, administrative personnel have left or been forced out of groups like the National Education Association. However, many subject matter and specialty groups still tend to be dominated by teacher educators. Decisions in the professional organization domain concern such issues as salaries, benefits, working conditions, job security, and licensure.

The third domain, school system decisions, encompases decisions concerning the operation of more than one school. These decisions may range from equal educational opportunity guidelines at the federal level to state policies regarding proficiency standards for high school graduation to local school district decisions regarding resource allocation. Decisions about curriculum, such as the selection of textbooks, may be made at this level or they may be delegated to individual schools. While teachers sometimes are invited to provide input, generally these decisfons are made by elected or appointed officials and groups.

The fourth domain covers those decisions made at the level of the single school. Decisions range from policy making and general administration to curriculum and staff development. The extent to which decisions are actually made at this level varies greatly from district to district and even among schools within a single district.[1] In districts with an active authoritarian central administration, few decisions may be left to the individual schools.

---

[1] Data supporting this contention have been collected by the authors and will appear in a forthcoming report. Also consult the work of David (1975).

In schools with weak principals and little or no professional contact among teachers, most decisions may be made at the classroom level. Traditionally, there are few decisions which are the specific province of the single school. Rather, whatever decisions have not been made at other levels have been made in single schools.

However, at this time, there are indications that single school decisions are becoming of greater interest to educators and educational researchers. Legislation mandating the formation of school site councils with budgetary oversight indicates that this domain's importance is increasing. Schlechty (1976, p. 67) observes that,

> With increading attention to deconsolidation, neighborhood schools, and community control, it is likely that the building level will become an increasingly important location for both operation and analysis.

We also believe that the single school is potentially the most fruitful domain for teacher involvement in decision making. Only at this level can large numbers of teachers have meaningful collegial contact (in contrast with the isolation of the classroom) while still remaining teachers (in contrast with the second and third domains, which usually require leaving the classroom). Single school decisions thus will serve as the focus of this study.

Conclusion

We have argued that, all other things being equal, increased teacher participation in school-level decision making processes is desirable. However, we admit that at least two relevant questions remain unresolved.

First, how do teachers feel about the prospect of increased involvement in decision making? Although current evidence concerning teachers' feelings is scant and mixed, our suspicion is that if properly orchestrated, this change would be perceived as a great boon to the teaching profession.

A recent field study by the authors (Duke, Showers, and Imber, 1979), in fact, finds that teachers perceive many benefits to be associated with involvement in school decision making.

Second, what effect will increased teacher involvement in decision making have on student outcomes? While research showing a postive correlation between worker decision making and industrial productivity is encouraging, we recognize that generalization of these findings to schools is unjustified at this time.

We now turn our attention to the development of a typology of the various school-level decisions in which teachers are or may become involved. We will argue that, while examples can be found of some teacher involvement in almost all types of school-level decisions, these examples are exceptional. In addition, we will argue that even in cases where teachers are included in decision making, their impact is usually quite limited.

Teacher Involvement in School Dicision Making

Despite the preceding argument that workers, including teachers, should be involved in workplace decision making, teachers currently have limited influence over school decisions. Since there has been no systematic attempt to review recent literature on school decision making or to assess the extent to which teachers are seeking involvement in the process, this section will serve as an overview of contemporary developments. Specifically, our review will focus on decision making opportunities available to teachers (see Table 1), the level and extent of teacher involvement, and sources of impetus for teacher participationg in decision making.

Instructional Coordination

Probably because of the growing complexity of instructional methodology (i.e., individualized instruction) and architectural changes in school facilities (i.e., open-space design), there has been a steady increase in reports of team teaching (Cohen, 1976). Among other things, team teaching has created opportunities for teachers to make collaborative decisions concerning instructional coordination. In fact, teaming seems to focus more on planning together than teaching together. Among the specific decisions that can be made are the selection of learning materials and activities for multiple classrooms, the division of instructional responsibilities (specialization) and the determination of shared facilities (for example, learning centers).

Team teaching has been the focus of considerable research interest, particularly at Stanford University and the University of Oregon. In summarizing the work that has been done under her aegis in Stanford's Environment for Teaching Program, Cohen (1976) noted that team teachers interacted more than nonteam teachers and felt more influential and autonomous with respect to teaching tasks. Team members felt more influential at the level of school

TABLE 1

Types of Organizational Decisions

1 Instructional Coordination
1.1 Determining activities for multiple classrooms
1.2 Determining activities for teaching teams
1.3 Selecting instructional materials for more than one classroom

2 Curriculum Development
2.1 Determining curriculum outcomes or goals
2.2 Selecting curriculum content
2.3 Selecting an organizational format for content

3 Professional Development
3.1 Determining professional needs and goals
3.2 Planning professional development activities
3.3 Determining preservice needs and goals
3.4 Planning preservice educational activities
3.5 Selecting professional development personnel

4 Evaluation
4.1 Selecting methods for evaluating curriculum, programs, professional development activities, teacher effectiveness, etc.
4.2 Determining how to react to evaluation results

5 School Improvement
5.1 Determining areas in need of improvement
5.2 Planning school improvement
5.3 Identifying resources for school improvement

6 Personnel
6.1 Determining personnel needs
6.2 Determining criteria for selecting personnel
6.3 Selecting personnel
6.4 Determining criteria for removing personnel
6.5 Removing personnel
6.6 Assigning and reassigning personnel

7 Rules and Discipline
7.1 Determining school rules
7.2 Determining consequences for rule-breaking
7.3 Resolving conflicts concerning student behavior

8 General Administration
8.1 Determining how to allocate space
8.2 Determining how to allocate time (scheduling)
8.3 Determining school calendar
8.4 Determining how to allocate resources
8.5 Settling employee grievances
8.6 Determining public relations priorities
8.7 Approving extra-curricular activities
8.8 Determining organizational rewards
8.9 Determining budget
8.10 Determining student placement

9 Policymaking
9.1 Determining how policy is to be made
9.2 Determining local goals for education
9.3 Determining how to comply with external mandates, legislation, etc.
9.4 Determining rules for employees
9.5 Determining program priorities

decision making as well as the classroom level, a finding Cohen and her group did not anticipate.

Johnson (1975), a member of Cohen's group, discovered that participation in instructional coordination activities actually led to involvement in other types of school decision making, particularly in schools where more than half the teachers were engaged in highly interdependent teams. As Johnson put it, "the greater the intensity and extensity of teacher collaboration in daily work, the more likely it is that teachers will participate in school decisions which in other schools are left primarily to principals" (p. 36). Among the school decisions in which these teachers participated was the determination of how to use paid aides, which new teachers to hire, how to utilize building facilities, and how to assign students to teachers.

Studies undertaken by members of the university of Oregon's Project MITT (Management Implications of Team Teaching) support some of the findings of the Stanford group, but they also introduce several reasons why caution should be exercised in making any generalizations about the impact of teaming. For example, Duckworth and Jovick (1978) conclude that it is necessary to specify the kind and extent of teaching collaboration before predicting the effects of its occurrence. In other words, instructional coordination can take place in a variety of ways besides teaming, and it is likely that each of these ways has a different impact on such outcomes as teacher involvement in school decision making.

Project MITT focused on "unit schools" in which "permanent and official teacher work groups" had been created. While considerable instructional coordination occurred in these unit schools, Schmuck, Paddock, and Packard (1977) report that teachers did <u>not</u> feel, either individually or as a group, that they exerted more influence over school decisions after the installation of the units.

Just how prevalent teaming has become is difficult to estimate. Typically, though, teaming is implemented on a voluntary basis, so that there are probably many schools in which only a portion of the faculty is engaged in collaborating on instructional coordination decisions. While it appeared originally in elementary schools, teaming seems to be spreading to secondary schools. A recent survey of secondary principals indicated that over half the schools experienced increased team planning during the past five years.[1]

Instructional coordination can take place as a result of processes other than teaming or the formation of unit schools. Working with the conceptual tools of the political scientist, Hanson (1978) breaks schools down into assorted formal and informal coalitions, spheres of influence, and power bases. Interest groups often form around particular issues and dissolve upon their resolution. It was found that school administrators could not directly control many instructional decisions. On the other hand, principals at the secondary level commonly delegate instructional coordination responsibilities to department chairpersons. These individuals typically enjoy some influence over the allocation of resources within the department and scheduling.

In summary, teachers have enjoyed some opportunities to plan collaboratively, but examples of shared decision making such as teaming and unit schools still appear to be the exception rather than the rule.

Curriculum Development

While many decisions regarding curriculum development may appear to belong more in the domain of classroom than school decision making, the fact that much course content is considered to be part of a sequence of learning

---

[1]The authors wish to express their appreciation to Susan Abramowitz of the National Institute of Education for sharing the unpublished results of the NIE/NASSP "Survey of Public Secondary School Principals."

experiences connecting one year of study with the next means that few curriculum decisions made by individual teachers are without implications for other teachers. Among the curriculum decisions that may be addressed by teachers are the determination of curriculum outcomes or goals, the selection of actual content, and the choice of ways to organize and sequence content.

The most recent wave of interest in collaborative curriculum decision making dates from the post-Sputnik era when educators were called on to work with scientists in an effort to produce more talent in the basic and later the social sciences. Generally, the projects that characterized the curriculum reform movement were national, rather than local, in scope. At least one observer (Sarason, 1971) felt that this fact was largely responsbile for the failure of the "new curricula" to make a greater impact on American education. Sarason contended that the proper level for effective curriculum decision making was the local school or district rather than the nation.

The value of on-site decision making has been recognized recently by various policymakers, including the shapers of California's Hart Bill, which requires the development of proficiency standards for high school graduation. While the State Department of Education provides guidelines and technical assistance, the expectation underlying the bill is that each district, through its constituent schools, will devise a set of graduation requirements for which students are accountable. Other states besides California are providing opportunities for teachers, as well as parents and sometimes students, to become involved in setting proficiency standards and making other kinds of curriculum decisions. Canada also has made limited moves in the direction of more decentralized curriculum decision making (Oberg, 1975).

Impetus for teacher involvement in curriculum decision making has derived from change in school design as well as state mandates for new graduation requirements. In comparing open space and conventional elementary schools, Meyer and Cohen (1971) found that teachers in the former schools interacted more often over curriculum issues (p. 30), perceived themselves more often to exercise a "great deal of influence" in curriculum planning (p. 48), and judged the principal to exercise influence less often (p. 48). When Johnson (1975) surveyed the principals in 188 California elementary schools, he found that three quarters of them always or nearly always consulted or involved teachers in curriculum decision making. He also obtained indications that teacher involvement was somewhat greater in schools where teaming occurred. Unfortunately, Johnson's study included no general check on the perceptions of principals. It is conceivable that these individuals shared a perception of teacher involvement that differed from the teachers' perceptions.

Being involved in making, or being consulted about, curriculum decisions is not necessarily the same as exercising control over what decisions are made. Walker (1977), while acknowledging the relative autonomy of teachers "behind the classroom door," observes that "the teacher's role is constrained and limited by decisions made outside the classroom, out of his or her control" (p. 19). Some of the external decisions cover such areas as the assignment of students, scheduling, textbook approval, and selection of standardized tests. Currently Floden (1978b) and a group of researchers at Michigan State's Institute for Research on Teaching are studying who controls what is taught in classrooms. They note that teachers should not be regarded as autonomous curriculum decision makers if the content choices they make are based on a limited range of options (i.e., a district list of approved textbooks). Floden (1978a) further reports that teachers display a surprising willingness

to change their course content, whatever the source of pressure for change. Such malleability may indicate teachers' internal conflict between professional and organizational roles, a dilemma discussed in detail by Anderson (1968) and Corwin (1970).

There are a variety of pressure groups competing for influence over curriculum content. Any effort by teachers to expand their authority over the curriculum would entail considerable political activity and struggle. One group with which teachers would have to contend would be school administrators. Francke (1967) provides evidence that teacher production of curriculum plans is directly related to the congruence of teacher and administrator perceptions of school organizational structure. A second group vying for influence includes supervisors, curriculum coordinators, and fulltime department chairpersons. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development represents the interests of these individuals. Recently ASCD published a book entitled Curriculum Leaders: Improving Their Influence (Speiker, 1976) in which the above role groups plus university professors of curriculum are urged to exercise greater leadership over curriculum development. To the extent that school administrators and university-based educators seek to exert control over curriculum content, teachers' opportunities to participate in curriculum planning would seem to be curtailed.

Besides the obvious forces competing for involvement in curriculum decision making, evidence exists of more subtle influences at work. In a unique effort to conceptualize curriculum decision making, Walker (1971) observes that not all curricular courses of action are arrived at through formal, explicit processes. Some content choices are made "automatically," coming about as the result of "implicit" predispositions and socialized perspectives of the world that the curriculum developer may not fully recognize.

Walker concluses that it would be awkward to speak of these choices as formal decisions.

It appears that teacher involvement in curriculum decision making is not a simple process to understand. This apparent complexity is heightened by the fact that it is still uncertain whether or not teachers as a group desire greater involvement in curriculum decision making. A poll taken by the National Education Association found that 62% of the teachers surveyed were involved as much as they wanted to be in curriculum decision making.[1] Research by Alutto and Belasco (1972) and Conway (1976) finds that some teachers may be involved more than they desire. Kirst and Walker (1971) observe that teachers have failed to bring curriculum matters to the collective bargaining table, a fact which seems to suggest their relatively low importance, at least when compared to "bread and butter" issues.

Despite the indications that some teachers are reluctant to press for greater involvement in curriculum decision making, Imber (1978) makes the case that teachers are in a position to make a unique contribution to the development of new curricula and that ultimately the benefactors of such involvement would include the entire school community. He notes that decision making involvement could make the job of teaching more challenging, responsible, and stimulating and facilitate the sharing of information.

Professional Development

One of the most talked about issues among contemporary educators is professional development. Several factors account for this interest, among

---

[1] "Teacher Involvement in School Policies and Procedures," Today's Education, vol. 58, no. 4 (April 1969), p. 6.

them public demands for quality education and, with shrinking enrollments at the preservice level, the desire of teacher education institutions to expand into inservice markets. Lower teacher turnover and general feelings of economic insecurity mean that more teachers are remaining in their jobs for longer periods of time. How to provide this growing percentage of veteran teachers with new knowledge relevant to their professional responsibilities has become a primary focus for decision making at the school, professional organization, and school system levels.

Historically control over the substance of inservice education, who would offer it, and when it would be offered rested with teacher educators, school district officials, and building principals. As McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) note, teachers "were invited to participate without having significant decision-making power and without time being given for them to participate meaningfully" (p. 91). Recently, however, there has been a concerted effort by various groups -- including the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the Teacher Corps -- to increase teacher involvement in professional development decision making. The general feeling of these groups seems to have been captured by Edelfelt (Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1976), when he specified as one guideline for the governance of professional development that (p. 5),

> Decisions are made by the people who are affected, and the decisions are made as close to possible to the situation where they will be operative.

While experts (Joyce, et. al., 1976, p. 9) conclude that no one group currently controls professional development, evidence suggests that the forementioned groups have been successful in expanding teacher involvement. The most notable indication can be found in recent federal legislation providing financial support for Teacher Centers (PL 94-482, 1976). While

decision making regarding Teacher Centers generally belongs in the domain of school system decisions rather than single school decisions (since centers tend to serve more than one school), a brief overview of the growth of these innovative enterprises may be useful in understanding certain issues related to the focus of this paper.

Inspiration for Teacher Centers seems to have come from Great Britian, where teachers had been actively engaged in operating local, regional, and national centers. Centers function as places where teachers collaborate on designing a new curriculum, receive direct instruction, or undertake an independent project. When the first centers were established in the United States, however, they sometimes failed to adopt the English system of teacher-based governance. For example, American centers sometimes have fulltime directors who are not classroom teachers. These individuals exercise considerable influence over what professional development opportunities were offered.[1] One of the oldest centers in the U.S. is the Detroit Center for Professional Growth and Development. While teachers sit on several subject matter advisory committees, the five-person Governance Board consists of only one teacher representative (the President of the Detroit Federation of Teachers). The other members include the President of the Organization of School Administrators and Supervisors, Detroit's General Superintendent of Schools, the Superintendent of the County (Intermediate) District, and the Dean of Wayne State University's College of Education.

Concerned that the control of Teacher Centers seemed to have drifted outside the teaching profession, the NEA, among other groups, took the position that Teacher Centers should be planned, governed, and evaluated largely

---

[1] Our appreciation to Sam Yarger of Syracuse University for this information.

by teachers.[1] The federal legialation establishing support for Teacher Centers reflected this position by requiring that the governing boards of all federally funded centers consist of a majority of teachers.

Obviously Teacher Centers are only one of many ways to deliver professional development services. Other formats include university courses, school site extension courses, special workshops and inservice days, conferences, school visitation, sabbaticals, and consultation. Teachers have expressed dissatisfaction with many of these approaches (Duke, 1977a). Lawrence (1974), in a major review of studies of inservice programs, concludes that those with the best chance of being effective are "those that involve teachers in planning and managing their own professional development activities, pursuing personal and collective objectives, sharing, applying new learnings and receiving feedback." The ISTE reports (Joyce et.al., 1976) document similar feelings of teachers regarding activities to be pursued, opportunities to learn from other teachers, and the feasibility of on-the-job application and feedback.

One of the decisions that teachers seem to be most interested in influencing concerns the designation of professional development priorities. There are indications that the training topics which interest teachers the most are not always identical to those that concern administrators or teacher educators -- the role groups traditionally involved in setting inservice priorities (Stephens, 1975).

A national survey of 1200 teachers conducted by the NEA (Yarger, et.al., 1976), found that teachers were more interested in training that covered basic teaching strategies across the content areas and general teaching skills like classroom management than in studying students' learning,

---

[1]Our appreciation to Don McComb of the National Education Association for sharing the NEA position paper on Teacher Centers with us.

organizational patterns of schools, or instructional materials. As teachers begin to determine more of their own professional development activities, there may be need for caution, however. Peterson (1978) notes, for example, that the issues vital to the average teacher may not necessarily be similar to those that interest the "committed professional reformer".

One mechanism by which teachers in a school can determine their professional development priorities and participate in the on-going governance of their inservice education is the work-study team (Hagberg, et. al., 1977). Developed by the Hoover-Stanford Teacher Corps Project, the work-study team consists of teachers and university resource people. Meeting together on a regular basis over the course of a year or more, a team addresses a particular problem area, collects information that will increase members' understanding of it, devises strategies for improvement, and supervises the implementation of those strategies. While initially teachers in the project sometimes felt uneasy about setting agendas for work-study teams, eventually some individuals demonstrated a willingness to assume leadership roles.

So far nothing has been said about the training of new teachers, but clearly this is also part of professional development. While teachers at the local level have not been as interested or involved in making decisions about preservice education as they have about inservice education, there are signs that others would like to see greater teacher participation. Much of the impetus for this concern derives from Teacher Corps, which feels that preservice and inservice education should be part of the same professional development continuum. Representatives of this perspective see experienced teachers as invaluable resources for novices, and they regard new teachers as important

---

[1] Refer to a news item by Steve Hallmark in ASCD's "News Exchange", vol. 20, no. 2 (May 1978), p. 7.

carriers of new ideas to veterans.

Despite some of the new developments outlined above, local decision making regarding professional development still tends to be controlled by individuals other than classroom teachers. The focus of inservice education, how it is delivered, who offers it, and how it will be evaluated and rewarded generally are determined by principals, supervisors, and central office personnel. It is not clear, however, that teachers deliberately have been excluded from decisions concerning the governance of professional development. Possibly, professional development ranks so low among the priorities of many teachers that rather than expend efforts in planning and implementing staff development programs, teachers are willing to accept passively the programs prepared for them, and then later point to their irrelevance as confirming evidence that professional development is not a worthwhile expenditure of time and energy.

Evaluation

Currently great concern surrounds educational issues related to evaluation: declining student achievement, the effectiveness of externally funded programs, school accountability, and the assessment of professional performance. Among the decisions which must be made in this area are the selection of criteria and methods for evaluating students, curriculum, new programs, schools, school systems, individual teachers, and professional development activities. Determining how to interpret and respond to evaluation data constitute two additional foci for decision making.

Of all the potential school decisions related to evaluation, those associated with teacher performance have generated some of the greatest concern among teachers. Considerable dissatisfaction is heard concerning the infrequency of administrative observations, the lack of clarity regarding evaluation criteria, and the low level of subject matter expertise possessed

by most administrator-evaluators. One of the primary efforts to correct these problems while simultaneously providing teachers with more opportunities for involvement has been the push for collegial evaluation.

The case for collegial evaluation is put succinctly by Bruno and Nottingham (1976, pp. 29-30):

> Teachers are in the best position to evaluate other teachers, and more importantly, they are more likely to get cooperation from poorer teachers toward increased performance, since they are not placed in the adversary teacher-administrator role.

Further argument for teacher involvement in evaluation comes from a recent study by Vavrus (1978), who reports that teacher alienation may result in part from the perception of lack of participation in the evaluation of one'e own work.

A pilot test of collegial evaluation by Roper, Deal, and Dornbusch (1976) seems to uphold Vavrus's conclusion. Most of the 30 teachers and teacher trainees reacted favorably to the experiment, gaining new ideas for self-improvement and feeling a sense of job control. The collegial evaluation model that was tested consisted of seven steps:

1. Choosing a partner
2. Selecting evaluation criteria
3. Self-assessment
4. Student assessment
5. Observations
6. Conference on evaluations
7. Development of an improvement plan

The first, second, and seventh steps require formal decisions to be made, though, interestingly, teachers are not involved in step one. The principal, for several reasons, is responsible for selecting collegial evaluation pairs.

The aspect of the above model with the most radical implications for the school authority structure clearly is teacher determination of evaluation criteria. In the experiment teachers found this phase the most difficult. Five guidelines were established for the selection of evaluation criteria:

1. The two teachers identify the pool of possible criteria using such sources as school goals, accountability guidelines, recent research, and their own philosophy.
2. Each teacher makes a list of four or five criteria and exchanges lists with his or her partner.
3. The two teachers agree on a list of four or five criteria.
4. The two teachers review the list to make sure each criterion is specific and observable.
5. The criteria are listed on the observation form.

Bruno and Nottingham (1976) offer a model that differs somewhat from the preceding one. They deal with collegial teams rather than pairs. Teachers join a team voluntarily, and if a vacancy occurs, the team conducts interviews to decide who will fill it. While the previous statement seems to imply highly decentralized authority, Bruno and Nottingham, in fact, see the principal in quite conventional terms. The principal is perceived as a leader and decision maker who must periodically seek information before personally making decisions. Thus, the collegial teams turn out to be purely advisory bodies. Teachers may be highly involved, but the ultimate influence over professional evaluation is exercised by the building administrator.

Evidence on the impact of collegial evaluation programs is mixed, and there is reason to avoid simplistic endorsements that belie the complexity of the phenomenon. Dornbusch and Scott (1975, pp. 185-186) report on a study of 131 public school teachers which concludes that they are often satisfied with evaluation systems over which they exercise little influence. At the same time, however, the teachers seldom expressed dissatisfaction with evaluation systems over which they exercised considerable influence. On the other hand, collegial evaluation can be perceived by teachers as personally threatening and potentially destructive of social

relationships at the school site. Marram, Dornbusch, and Scott (1972) found that elementary school teachers had little respect for evaluations of their teaching by other teachers. One reason for their skepticism concerned the teachers' low estimate of the value of professional knowledge, skill, and training. A second reason was the lack of visibility of teachers' work to each other.

Team teaching, to the extent that it increases this visibility as well as the opportunities for teacher interaction, holds promises for stimulating more positive feelings toward collegial evaluation. In a previously cited study, Meyer and Cohen (1971) found that teachers in open-space schools report much more frequent informal collegial evaluation and greater legitimation of collegial evaluation than their counterparts in self-contained classrooms.

Despite the encouraging findings, team teaching still is the exception rather than the rule in American schools. Overall, decisions involving teacher evaluation, as well as other types of school-level assessment, continue to be influenced primarily by administrators.

School Improvement

One of the criticisms of educational innovation has been its piecemeal quality. Arguments that only comprehensive change can produce tangible results have led to relatively largescale school improvement efforts during the last decade. Rather than concentrating narrowly on the modification of a particular curriculum or teaching method, these efforts have tended to address a number of changes, including alterations in the authority structure of the school. While typically these new programs have been introduced in a top-down fashion, sometimes teachers have had an opportunity to guide school improvement efforts by helping to decide on areas in need of change,

planning intervention efforts, and locating relevant resources.

In a brief review such as this one, it is impossible to cover in detail all the recent school improvement programs that have involved teachers at some point in decision making. Therefore, several illustrative programs have been selected. They include the forementioned San Jose Teacher Involvement Project (TIP), Individually Guided Education (IGE), and California's new School Improvement Program (SIP).

TIP was intended to achieve three primary outcomes (San Jose Teachers Association, 1977):

1. To encourage the processing of problems through local governance structure.
2. To continue and extend teacher involvement by providing a means by which teachers could use their professional judgment to influence and improve the instructional programs for students.
3. To provide funds for implementation of programs designed and managed by teachers to solve the problems identified through the governance structure.

The heart of TIP was the mini-grant, a small sum of money (supported by a large grant from NIE) that could be obtained by district teachers with ideas for school improvement. While in some ways the relatively small number of mini-grant requests that actually were received was disappointing, the quality of the proposals that eventually got support demonstrated to project personnel and evaluators that "given the responsibility for spending funds, teachers used their decision making process and their professional judgment to improve the educational experiences for children" (San Jose Teachers Association, 1977, p. 14). In the opinion of those involved in supervising TIP, the program's most significant impact, however, was not improved educational experiences for children, but the development of an on-site self-governance process in 12 out of the 19 participating schools. The key

elements of this process included a means of making decisions, a way to resolve disagreements, the identification of constituency groups, the assessment of school needs, and the setting of school priorities.

While the IGE program shares with TIP a concern with comperhensive school improvement, it is quite different in many respects. Sponsored by the Kettering Foundation, IGE entails a variety of methods and procedures by which a school can be reorganized and members of the school community can reach concensus on annual objectives. A pamphlet entited "/I/D/E/A/'s guide to an Improvement Program for Schools" presents the basic beliefs underlying the program:

1. The individual school is a strategic unit of educational change.

2. The culture of the school is central both to understanding and to effecting educational improvement.

3. Given existing social and educational constraints, most individual schools are not strong enough to overcome the inertia against change built into the typical school district.

4. Each school needs a process by which it can deal effectively with its own problems and effect its own change.

Whereas authority for TIP was vested, to a considerable extent, in the San Jose Teachers Association and its building representatives, decision making in IGE schools is subject to shared authority among administrators, teachers, parents, and students (in secondary schools). To facilitate decision making, schools are divided into semi-autonomous learning communities, each of which addresses issues such as the curriculum, scheduling, and student advisement. Currently thousands of elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States have installed IGE, but the lack of a comprehensive assessment of a random sample of these schools makes it difficult to

comment on the extent to which participating teachers feel they enjoy influence over school improvement decision making.

One of the most recent efforts to decentralize school improvement is California's SIP, the outgrowth of Assembly Bill 65 (1977), an omnibus education bill covering everything from school finance to the education of disadvantaged and handicapped students. AB 65 calls for participating schools to establish school site councils made up of teachers, administrators, parents, community people, and students (at the secondary level). No group is permitted to have more than half the membership of a council. As yet it is too early to determine if this provision will effectively prevent the monopolization of influence by any one group.

The details of AB 65 indicate that school site councils can provide advice for a variety of school decisions, including instructional coordination, curriculum development, professional development, program evaluation, general administration, and policymaking. Councils also receive state funds over which they exert control. What remains unclear is whether the councils are strictly advisory or actually enjoy authority to make school decisions. Informal observations and discussions with California educators so far suggest that the role to be played by a given council ultimately will be decided by the local building principal.

Some notion of the problems school site councils may encounter in California can be found in an unpublished assessment of their predecessors, the advisory boards for the Early Childhood Education Program (California State Department of Education, 1977). ECE schools with increasing reading scores were found to be distinguishable from ECE schools with decreasing reading scores by the following factors:

1. "Increasing" schools did not experience the misunderstanding of program intent to the extent that "decreasing" schools did. In the latter group, individuals did things because they believed someone else required them.

2. Incentives orginally designed to reinforce the intent of ECE were misused on unrelated local purposes in "decreasing" schools.

3. "Decreasing" schools tended to be characterized by a leadership vacuum or negative leadership.

With regard to the third factor, it is interesting to note that "increasing" schools with positive leadership did not always receive that leadership from the principal. In three schools teachers provided the guidance necessary for effective program implementation. The report concludes that the "leadership potential of a core group of teachers at a school should be acknowledged and supported where possible" (p. 20).

In reviewing recent school improvement efforts, it is clear that some attempt has been made in most cases to involve teachers. What is not apparent is the extent to which teachers have been central to the process by which actual decisions concerning school improvement have been made. California's school site councils spotlight the problem. On one hand, teachers are guaranteed a voice on the councils, but at the same time so too are parents, community representatives, and students (at the secondary level). The confusion over the teacher's role in school improvement also surfaces in the general educational literature. There are plenty of advocacy statements, such as the following one by Andrew (1974, p. 2):

> The basic premise is that effective change is accomplished where those primarily responsible for implementing and supporting change have a major role in planning, choosing and directing desired changes. Individuals with this responsibility are the teachers.

However, the view which seems to prevail among many who have studied the problem of school improvement, including the National Institute of Education (1978)

and Sarason (1971), is expressed well by Bredo and Bredo (1975, p. 21):

> Strong administrative leadership may be an effective approach to implementing major change, particularly in the case of resistance from some of the organization's members. Administrators may bolster their position by enlisting increased support from superiors.... If such support is not forthcoming, and if an administrator is weak or no longer has the confidence of the staff, attempts to impose changes are not likely to meet with success.

The history of largescale school improvement efforts seems to confirm this observation. Most change has come from the top down, rather than from such grassroots elements as local teachers (Duke, 1978b).

Personnel

The sixth type of school decision concerns personnel matters, ranging from the determination of needs and the establishment of recruitment criteria to the actual selection of teachers, administrators, and other school staff. Other personnel decisions that may be of particular interest to teachers currently involve the reassignment and removal of teachers.

One of the characteristics of professional organizations such as hospitals and law firms has been direct participation by professional staff in decision making regarding personnel. As will be discussed later, however, the role of teachers as professionals in essentially bureaucratic organizations has been unclear. Johnson (1975) observes that personnel decisions typically are one of the school decisions in which teachers are least involved. He found, though, in his study of open-space schools that the presence of team teaching was associated with higher (though still low) levels of teacher involvement in personnel decisions. Bruno and Nottingham (1976, p. 84) note that these decisions usually concern the selection of new team members. Johnson's study does not specify the extent to which teachers in open-space schools are involved in personnel decisions other than those relating to

team membership. Probably the most publicized attempt to involve teachers in personnel decisions has been the Temple City Plan, a differentiated staffing scheme in southern California. Teachers are empowered to select their senior teachers and master teachers and to remove them if they prove unsatisfactory (National School Public Relations Association, 1970, p. 6). It is indicative of the complexity of the issue of teacher involvement in school decision making, however, that differentiated staffing schemes such as Temple City's have been opposed by teacher organizations. In large part because of this resistance, few districts now possess differentiated staffing arrangements.

During the past decade a variety of alternative schools have been created, many through the direct efforts of disgruntled teachers. Many of these schools can be characterized by a high degree of teacher involvement in personnel decisions (Duke, 1978b; McConahay, et al., 1973). In some European countries, teachers determine who will fill their positions when they take a leave of absence or sabbatical and what the substitute will be paid. While it is unlikely that, in the near future, conventional U.S. public schools will adopt this European practice or come to resemble contemporary alternative schools, they may try to increase the involvement of teachers in personnel decision making. Should such a development occur, it probably would be due more to pragmatic management policies than to a sincere belief in workplace democracy or professional control by school administrators. The reasoning is simple. Due to declining enrollments and taxpayers' revolts, such as California's Proposition 13, many decisions on how to reduce staff are having to be made. From an administrator's standpoint, involving teachers in making these unpopular decisions can be viewed as a prudent form of self-protection.

Rules and Discipline

If complaints are an accurate measure of concern, then student behavior problems probably would be the single greatest focus of teacher interest. Often out of desperation, fear, or both, some teachers are forcing their associations and unions to bring school discipline issues to the bargaining tables (Duke, 1979; Duke, Donmoyer, and Farman, 1978). Pressure is being placed on building administrators to be more assertive with students who misbehave and supportive of teacher-initiated disciplinary actions. Some frustrated teachers concentrate on establishing an orderly classroom and ignore problems elsewhere in the school.

The kinds of decisions that have to be made if teachers wish to deal with student behavior problems at the school, rather than the classroom level, include the determination of rules, consequences for breaking rules, and mechanisms for resolving conflicts between students and teachers. In addition, provisions are needed for handling inconsistent enforcement of rules (Duke, 1978a). Duke (1977b) and Francis (1975, p. 162) support the need for a high degree of teacher involvement in making all of these decisions, believing that the odds of getting effective enforcement are greatest when those who must see that rules are obeyed are involved in making them, along with those subject to the rules. Elsewhere, though, Duke (1979) notes that teachers are not involved very much in making decisions regarding school rules and discipline policies. It seems ironic that teacher authority for making these decisions appears to be eroding, particularly in light of recent court decisions, at the same time that public expectations that teachers will exercise tight control over student conduct are increasing. Watson and Clark (no date) express much the same thought when they state that teachers today

have "minimal freedom" and "maximum responsibility." Whether control can be increased while authority slips away remains to be seen, but the odds appear to be low.

Recently the belief has increased that consistent rule enforcement and effective discipline are related to school size. Presumably, the larger the school, the more difficult it is to coordinate discipline activities or ensure consistency. Abramowitz and Rasmussen tested this belief in elementary schools and failed to confirm it, however.[1] They found that program size and common program policies regarding student behavior were not significantly correlated. They also discovered, however, that the presence of common program policies was positively related to level of teacher interaction. In other words, a key factor in the development of common disciplinary policies seems to be the frequency with which teachers communicate, not the size of the school. Johnson (1975, p. 46) and Meyer and Cohen (1971, p. 48) support this conclusion, noting that open-space schools with team teaching are characterized by greater teacher influence and less administrator influence over disciplinary decisions than schools with self-contained classrooms and low levels of teacher interaction.

Whether the preceding findings are applicable to secondary schools as well as elementary schools remains unclear. Duke and Perry (1978), in a study of alternative high schools, hypothesize that small size is a major factor in explaining why these alternatives seem to experience fewer discipline problems than large high schools nearby. Clearly the demand for rules and policies for handling behavior problems is greater

---

[1]Our appreciation to Susan Abramowitz and Roger Rasmussen for sharing their unpublished study entitled "The Effects of Program Size on Program Organization and Management."

in secondary schools than in elementary schools. In addition, the presence of many more teachers, more administrators, and a departmentalized structure in secondary schools contribute to reducing the likelihood of effective coordination of discipline policies.

All of this is not to say, however, that conventional public high schools do not involve teachers at all in making schoolwide disciplinary decisions. As in the case of personnel decisions, though, it seems likely that many administrators consider teacher involvement only when the situation has grown so serious or difficult that they themselves would prefer not to deal with it alone.

General Administration

General administration as a decision category is a catch-all covering many school matters not included in the other eight categories. Of course, it overlaps most of the other types of school decisions at various points, but usually general administration decisions are more "managerial" or maintenance-oriented than other types. Traditionally the decisions which principals make on a routine basis pertain to general administration. Examples include allocation of resources (time, space, materials), settlement of minor grievances, determination of the extra-curricular program, and on-site budgetary matters.

Within the context of conventional public schools there is little evidence of teacher involvement in general administration decision making. Sometimes in small elementary schools, often located in rural districts, one teacher may be designated a "teaching principal," but this practice typically bespeaks more of a concern with economies of scale than a commitment to teacher leadership. In 1977, the California Teachers Association,

in its "Initial CTA Legislative Goals for Educational Reform," called for legislation to establish pilot programs in which schools would be administered by teacher committees in lieu of principals.[1] The rationale for the recommendation included the following two points:

1. The current lack of confidence in most school management by both teachers and the public suggests that new approaches be explored.
2. Such pilot programs might well return the schools to a position where the term principal really means "principal teacher," a co-worker and colleague selected by the faculty as department heads are now selected in some secondary schools.

For reasons that are not clear the CTA did not press for the above recommendation. Perhaps it had never been intended to be more than a trade-off item for collective bargaining purposes. In any event, as of the end of 1978 no action has been taken to implement any teacher-run schools in California.

The one area where teacher involvement in general administration decision making might be studied empirically is alternative schooling. As has been discussed by Duke (1978a), many alternative schools have been created by teachers dissatisfied with conventional public education. Typically an organizational structure is selected which provides for collaborative decision making among all staff and often among students and parents as well. Full-time administrators are rare and, where they exist, they tend to be facilitators or coordinators rather than classical administrators. In one alternative school, New Haven's High School in the Community, teachers were expected to spend at least 10% of their time on administrative tasks. In assessing the school, evaluators (McConahay, et al., 1973) discovered that teachers varied in their desire to do these

---

[1] Our appreciation to Robert Stahl of the California Teachers Association for sharing with us a copy of this document.

tasks. Some spent much more than 10% of their time in general administration, while others spent almost no time, preferring to counsel students or teach additional classes. Unfortunately, decision making in teacher-run alternatives generally has not been researched as carefully as decision making in parent-initiated alternatives. Thus, it is difficult to assess the impact of this departure from the conventional school authority structure.

While occasionally publicity circulates about a school in which teachers participate in the allocation of resources or some other aspect of general administration, it is safe to conclude that this area is still predominantly the domain of the building administrator and his or her assistants. However, there are some indications that the future may bring changes. In California, budget cuts occasioned by Proposition 13 and declining enrollments are causing some districts to consider eliminating many relatively high-priced administrative positions. One district proposed cutting out two elementary principalships, at a savings of $60,000 and appointing teaching principals instead (Palo Alto Times, June 13, 1978, p. 2). From a different perspective, people like Sugarman (1977) are calling for more decentralized control over the expenditure of educational funds as a way of reducing parent and teacher alienation and upgrading the quality of schooling. He advocates, among other things, a "teacher trustee plan" whereby every teacher would have an account on which he or she could draw on behalf of student beneficiaries. The teacher then could decide whether or not to spend this money on teacher aides, field trips, or materials--rather than being presented with predetermined lists of budgeted items by the principal.

Policymaking

The final category of school decisions is policymaking. Katz and Kahn

(1978, p. 477) define policies as "abstractions or generalizations about organizational behavior, at a level that involves the structure of the organization." Policy, for present purposes, concerns the overarching decisions which serve to guide the making of the other eight types of decisions. Examples of policy decisions include determining school goals and priorities, rules for personnel, responses to external mandates (i.e., legislation, court rulings), and governance procedures (such as how policy is to be made).

A review of the history of educational policymaking generally finds teachers removed from the heart of the process. When teachers have been involved at all, typically they have functioned in the capacity of association or union representatives acting at the state or national level. Interestingly, these same professional organizations, though, have exerted little impact on local policymaking (Rosenthal, 1969). The situation may be changing gradually as a result of the spread of collective bargaining and "teacher power." A recent position paper by the California Teachers Association, for example, calls for teacher leadership in the following policy areas:[1]

1. Defining the goals and purposes of public education.
2. Obtaining sufficient funding for quality educational programs.
3. Structuring the organization of public education.
4. Establishing educational priorities.

Corwin (1970) found that a desire for more influence over school policy accounted for much of the teacher militancy and dissatisfaction he detected in 28 mid-west high schools.

---

[1]Our appreciation to Jim Williamson of the California Teachers Association for sharing with us a copy of "Expanded Preliminary Statement of Educational Reform Objectives by the Task Force on Educational Reform."

As early as 1925 the American Federation of Teachers was calling for the creation of teachers' councils, "controlled by the teachers, which would participate in the determination of educational policies" (School and Society, vol. 22, no. 557, August 29, 1925, p. 268). Not until half a century later, however, was there a significant movement in this direction. The previously cited Teacher Involvement Project in San Jose established faculty councils, which Watson and Clark (no date) refer to, somewhat hyperbolically, as "the first concrete step in a century toward changing that essentially imperial and bureaucratic tradition [of the public school system]." While the councils provided some opportunities for teachers to participate in local policymaking, there is little evidence to suggest they approached the degree of authority enjoyed by many workers' councils in other parts of the world (Levin, 1978). And despite increased rhetoric and teacher militancy, Parker (1976) found few indications that collective bargaining had resulted in any limitation in the policymaking authority of principals.

Traditionally, teachers interested in becoming involved in policymaking had to contend with local boards of education and administrators that jealously guarded their prerogatives. Today there are indications that teachers may have to contend with different forces if their voices are to be heard during the determination of school policies. California's Proposition 13, ostensibly a grassroots effort by believers in local control, actually may foreshadow the end of decentralized decision making at the district and school levels. With tremendous cuts in school revenues, California districts are being compelled to turn to the state government, which, if it agrees to bail them out of their fiscal dilemma, may demand more control over local educational decision making. Teachers desiring

greater involvement in local policymaking in the future may find themselves competing directly with the state legislature and the state educational bureaucracy for more authority. The administrators and board members with whom teachers once vied for influence one day may become allies, as campaigns are mounted to regain local control.

Assessing Teacher Involvement to Date

The preceding review of the various types of school-level decisions has included a number of examples of teacher involvement in all nine decision categories. While most such examples are atypical, they are nonetheless encouraging for advocates of workplace democracy because they illustrate the possibility of shared decision making.

Implicit in our assessment is the probability that individual schools vary both in the types of decisions on which they focus and the extent to which teachers are involved in making these decisions. Also variable is the extent to which different instances of teacher decision making involvement actually further the goals of workplace democracy. We suspect that some of our examples illustrate truly democratic distributions of decision making authority, while others constitute token changes in which actual control over decisions remains unaffected.

Unfortunately, there presently exists no theory which allows us to evaluate and compare the various possible levels of teacher involvement in decision making. The development of such a theory requires both an analysis of the school decision making process itself and an inquiry into the concept of influence. While we realize that we cannot accomplish these tasks within the scope of this study, we nevertheless feel that it is important to discuss the issues entailed in developing a basic framework for the assessment of teacher involvement. Thus we depart

briefly from the primary focus of this study in order to consider the following two questions:

1. What are the various phases of school decision making and how significant is each phase?
2. What is the relationship between involvement in decision making and influence over the decisions that are actually made?

Phases of Decision Making

Many studies of decision making tend to treat the process as a relatively unitary one. This simplified perception of decision making sustains an equally simplified notion of involvement in decision making in which individuals are seen as being either involved or not involved in making decisions.

However, such a perception of involvement in decision making does not appear to be very useful. The conceptual work of Janis and Mann (1977) and Simon (1976) as well as field studies by the authors indicate that decison making is multifaceted and complex. Where a process such as decision making is shown to consist of more than one phase, the possibility arises that a given participant may be involved in one phase but not another. In addition, for each phase varying degrees of involvement may be possible.

Janis and Mann (1977, pp. 171-200) isolate five distinct "stages" of decision making: 1) appraising the challenge, 2) surveying the alternatives, 3) weighing alternatives, 4) deliberating about commitment, and 5) adhering despite negative feedback. Simon (1960) sees a somewhat different sequence of activities constituting "rational" decision making. In condensing Simon's work, McCosh and Morton (1978) label his three phases of decison making as follows: intelligence (searching the environment for conditions calling for decision), design, and choice. Both schemes are

influenced by elements of psychology. Clark (1977), on the other hand, offers a conceptualization based more on the perspective of an anthropologist or sociologist. Using his scheme to describe the San Jose TIP, Clark posits five phases of decision making: 1) recommendation or suggesting ideas, 2) being informed of decisions, 3) being consulted about decisions, 4) being able to approve decisions, and 5) being able to authorize decisions.

While each of these "complex" conceptualizations of decision making is helpful, none provides the kind of theoretical framework we are seeking. We require an analysis of decision making which 1) accurately describes the process, and 2) divides it into distinct segments or phases each of which offers the possibility of involvement independent of involvement in any other phase. Based on an analysis of our field studies of decision making in schools, we suggest the following scheme:

1. Deciding to decide
2. Determining the guidelines on which decision making will be based
3. Providing information to assist in the process of reaching a decision
4. Designing a choice or choices
5. Expressing a preference for a particular choice

Before describing each phase, it should be noted that the above conception is an idealized version of formal decision making. In real life situations, many decisions are reached without going through every phase. In addition, human activity sometimes occurs spontaneously without any organized or even conscious decision making process. Nevertheless, we believe that the model succeeds in describing the usual progression of events that leads to most decisions in schools. It seems particularly useful for our goals of trying to understand the relative levels of involvement in decision making of different role groups and

for assessing the extent to which actual decisions characterize the outcomes of efforts by organization members to deal with problems.

For those seeking a discussion of non-formal decision making and some of the less rational dimensions of the process, the works of March and Olsen (1976) and Meyer and Rowan (1977) are recommended. The latter pair caution, for example, that a "sharp distinction should be made between the formal structure of an organization and its actual day-to-day work activities" (p. 341).

Returning now to our five-phased scheme, the first stipulated component of decision making--deciding to decide--often receives the least conscious attention both from those involved in decision making processes and those who study them. Often, it is assumed that a situation requiring a decision automatically initiates the decision making process. However, in reality, the range of situations and problems which could serve as the focus for decision making efforts is extremely large. It is during the initial phase that the problems which are deemed worthy of decision making efforts are identified.

When students of organizations speak of initiative and initiating behavior--characteristics typically associated with effective executives and leaders--they are referring, at least in part, to the act of deciding to decide. Individuals in positions to determine or influence the determination of whether or not a decision will be made obviously can exert considerable control over the decision making process, even when they do not participate in other phases. An illustration of this phenomenon in a school setting is when a principal establishes the agenda for a faculty meeting. In effect, the principal determines which decisions will be considered and which will not.

The second phase of the decision making process--determine the guidelines on which decision making will be based--is probably the least well understood. Some confusion exists about the exact nature of a "guideline" for decision making. Researchers have used a variety of terms to refer to decision guidelines and have described them in a variety of ways. Simon (1976), for example, speaks of the premises that undergird and influence decision making. He even defines a decision as "a conclusion drawn from a set of premises." These premises, however, seem to be antecedents of decision making, rather than integral components of the process itself. They are less procedural guidelines than predispositions or assumptions about the content of the decision to be made.

As we see it, guidelines limit and describe the course of action for reaching a decision that is legitimated by a given organization. They can be broad or narrow. They can entail designating the range of options from which a choice must be made, specifying the type or amount of information needed to reach a decision, or formulating the rules governing how a decision will be made. When a principal asks teachers to decide between three possible textbooks for ninth grade English, he or she is determining a guideline by controlling the options available. Premises enter the picture at the point where the decision to select one of the three actually is made. These premises, based on prevailing beliefs and biases, could lead the teachers to regard one book as more acceptable than the other two.

Once the guidelines have been determined, information concerning the decision to be made can be sought. Information may come from within or outside an organization, and it may be shared through written documents, closed deliberations, or open hearings. The amount of input into the decision making process can vary greatly from one situation to the next.

Iannaccone (1964, p. 229) writes that the "quality of decision-making in an organization is related to the amount of relevant information available concerning the issues under consideration." Janis and Mann (1977) propose a number of methods for improved decision making that are based directly or indirectly on upgrading the quality of information available to the decision-makers. An example of the importance of relevant information for school decision making concerns the evaluation of teachers for tenure. If a teacher has only been observed a few times during his or her probationary period, it is doubtful that sufficient data exists to make an informed decision. In addition, if those who observe the teacher are not familiar with the subject matter being taught and if they have made no effort to secure the opinions of specialists, the quality of the tenure decision is further in doubt.

Once information relevant to the problem at hand has been gathered, the time usually is appropriate for designing a choice or a set of choices. A choice may represent a proposed strategy, solution, person, or other response to a given concern, usually identified in the first phase of the decision making process. Choices generally address one of the following decisional questions: who, what, where, when, how, or how much. Simon (1960) has written extensively on the design phase of decision making. He notes that the act of designing possible courses of action actually can encompass a number of small decisions, a fact which makes this phase quite complicated to study. An example of the design phase of decision making in a school context would be when a teacher committee responds to a state mandate to establish high school proficiency standards by drafting several possible sets of graduation requirements to be submitted to the entire faculty.

Finally, expressing a preference--or the actual act of deciding--often represents the most visible and least complicated phase of the decision making process, particularly when a vote is the means by which preferences are expressed. Where other means are used--for example, decision by consensus--the process can become more complex and problematic, though (Janis, 1972). The act of deciding may range from one person unilaterally making a choice to a group of people casting secret ballots on which they have ranked several preferences. In any event, it is important to remember that actually expressing a preference is only the final phase of a complex process involving a preliminary commitment to decide, a set of guidelines on which decision making is based, certain information from within or outside the organization, and a designed choice or set of choices.

Now that a multi-phased conception of decision making has been presented, the discussion can turn to the question of the significance of each phase. Which phases have greatest impact on the outcome of the decision making process and which are less crucial? Which phases offer important opportunities for involvement by those who desire influence over the decisions made in schools? At which phase or phases are decisions usually finalized?

At first glance, it may seem that any phase of the process can be significant. However, more careful analysis suggests that some phases usually are more critical than others. The first two phases together serve to set the boundaries for the decision making process. They dictate the range of acceptable decisions, although usually not the specific decisions to be made. If a school site council agenda is allowed to include only trivial items for consideration, such control of the

initial phase effectively eliminates the possibility of significant decisions being made by the group. If a principal creates a very narrow set of guidelines for a curriculum committee, he similarly may render the committee's work inconsequential. Only when phase one results in consideration of potentially important decisions and phase two in guidelines which are sufficiently broad to encompass a variety of possible outcomes do the other phases become significant. In other words, the final three phases will appear important only to the extent that those in control of the early phases allow it to happen.

In examining examples of teacher involvement in school decision making, an interesting trend becomes apparent. Teachers are seldom involved in the first two decision making phases and infrequently involved (at least formally) in the fifth. When they are involved in decision making, it is usually either in the information gathering phase or in the designing of alternatives (within boundaries set by others). Thus, we begin to suspect that if cases of teacher involvement in school decision making are rare, cases in which teachers have real influence over decisions are even rarer. It appears that teachers are more likely to be accorded opportunities for limited involvement in school decision making than influence over the inputs or outcomes of the process. We now turn to the question of the relationship between involvement and influence.

Involvement and Influence

While involvement may best be thought of in terms of relatively distinct behaviors (i.e., deciding to decide, determining guidelines, providing information, designing choices, and expressing a preference), influence is less easily identified, observed, and measured. It concerns the intentional or unintentional control over a particular decision. Influence

may derive from personality, charisma, or position. Influence also may be based on situational proximity (being in the right place at the right time), possession of desirable resources, or control of sanctions. Influence may be brought to bear on any or all phases of decision making, either through direct intervention or more subtle mechanisms.

Whatever the basis of the influence or the way it is introduced into the decision making process, the important point to remember is that involvement and influence are distinct. An individual may exercise influence on a given decision and yet not be involved directly in the decision making process. For example, a local priest need not be invited to join a curriculum committee in order to influence the selection of a new sex education textbook. Conversely, an individual may be involved in decision making, yet not exercise any substantive influence over the eventual decision that is made. Teachers sometimes devote significant amounts of time to school site councils, curriculum committees, or peer review boards without even the hope of having an impact on the decisions which relate to the work of these groups. Such cases do little to promote the cause of workplace democracy.

While the study of involvement in decision making entails looking at a relatively formal process, an investigation of influence often requires learning about the informal organization and particular personalities. A knowledge of status factors, local customs, and organizational history also may be useful.

Johnson (1975) offers one of the few studies of school decision making that considers influence to be separate from involvement. He differentiates between participation--"'the active involvement or consultation' in the process leading up to a decision"--and influence--"the act of 'basically

making the decision in question" (p. 16). Drawing on Johnson's work, several types of guiding influence are possible. Without a particular person's influence, for example, a decision to decide about a particular problem may not have been made. Another possibility is that without a person's influence the actual decision may not have been made. Yet a third possibility can be termed negative influence. In this instance, an individual's support for one preference is perceived to be instrumental in the selection of another preference.

Returning to the various examples of teacher involvement discussed earlier, it appears that teachers do not enjoy much influence over most school decisions. The literature suggests that, despite some limited involvement in school decision making and the growing power of associations and unions, teachers continue to exert minimal impact on the outcomes of the process.

Token Changes

Most of the new developments in school decision making seem to represent token changes at best. Where teachers are involved in decision making at the school level, their involvement has been limited and sporadic. Efforts to stimulate teacher involvement, such as San Jose's TIP, seem to fade as soon as outside funding disappears or the novelty wears off. Evidence that teachers exercise influence over the making of most of the nine types of school decisions is lacking. The overall picture of the school authority structure, with few exceptions, is one of teachers functioning as leaders in their own classrooms and in their professional organizations, but not in their schools.

While most of the remainder of the paper tries to explain why teachers do not enjoy greater involvement or influence, it may be appropriate to

stop momentarily and ask why there have been any efforts at all, however minimal or shortlived, to increase teacher involvement and influence.

Speculating on the impetuses underlying moves to increase teacher involvement entails understanding organizational politics. Those in positions of authority in the education world realize they cannot ignore a group as large and as central to the process of schooling as teachers. By making token gestures toward shared decision making, school officials may feel they can enhance or, at least, maintain their authority. This can be accomplished in several ways.

First, involving a few teachers in school decision making may serve as a way of co-opting teacher leadership. Such a policy functions as a preventive mechanism reducing the likelihood that influential teachers will be forced to work outside the recognized bounds of the school authority structure. As March and Simon (1958, p. 54) have written:

> "Participative management" can be viewed as a device for permitting management to participate more fully in the making of decisions as well as a means for expanding the influence of lower echelons in the organization. In this respect, it resembles closely the phenomenon of co-optation....

In a related vein, Wise (1977) notes that administrative efforts to share decision making duties often constitute procedural rather than substantive changes. He goes further to say (p. 44):

> For example, the past decade has witnessed efforts to decentralize school systems, to provide for community participation, and to allow community control. But, prior to the advent of any of these reforms, school systems have procedures for arriving at decisions. Frequently, existing procedures are not removed to make way for new procedures; the new procedures simply are added to the old. A rational system of decision-making gives way to a hyper-rational system as added procedures rather than redistributed authority becomes the response.

Of course, not all the examples of teacher involvement discussed in the opening section represent conscious administrative efforts to co-opt teacher leadership. A second purpose that can be served by token attempts to share decision making relates to the maintenance of control over the workplace, rather than the prevention of the emergence of worker leadership. Kornhauser (1962) speaks of such a strategy as a "structural adjustment" and points out that some organizations utilize it to mitigate conflicts with professionals. Braverman (1974) prefers describing shared decision making, as it is usually found in organizations, as a "reform" representing a particular "style of leadership." He says of such reforms (p. 39):

> They are characterized by a studied pretense of worker "participation," a gracious liberality in allowing the worker...to have the illusion of making decisions by choosing among fixed and limited alternatives designed by a management which deliberately leaves insignificant matters open to choice.

Could Braverman's last comment pertain to recent advances by teachers as well as recent worker reforms? Recalling the previous discussion of new developments in teacher decision making, it may be remembered that the school decisions in which teachers have been allowed to participate have tended to concern a limited range of concerns--instructional co-ordination, curriculum development, staff development and school improvement. An argument can be made that these areas represent relatively low level concerns for school administrators. The decisions they consider to be critical to the operation of a school--and also the decisions in which teachers are least involved--relate to evaluation, personnel, general administration, and policymaking.

The contention that granting teachers limited involvement in school decision making can serve as a control mechanism for management possesses an intuitive validity rooted in political pragmatics. It is much easier to exercise control over discontented individuals if they express their discontent "within the system," than if they are forced to go outside. Occasions on which teachers come together with administrators to consider school matters provide valuable opportunities for the latter to reinforce organization norms, monitor gripes, and foster the impression of democratic governance.[1] Tensions can be confined within legitimate organization boundaries--a function similar to that served by a safety valve which redistributes excess pressure. Schiffer (1978) further notes that permitting teachers to enjoy limited involvement in school decision making has been used as a way in which administrators can inspire commitment to organization goals.

Mulder (1971) hypothesizes that when there are relatively large differences in the expert power of members of a system, an increase in participation in decision making by subordinates actually will increase the power differences between members. While his observations are based on the experiences of European work councils, Mulder's conclusion is applicable to many American schools experimenting with shared decision making. He states that "the introduction of greater participation provides the more powerful with an opportunity to exercise their influence over the less powerful, and thereby make their greater power a reality" (p. 34).

Besides serving as a device for the co-optation of teacher leadership and a technique for controlling teachers, shared decision making--in limited amounts--also can function as a form of protection for school

---

[1]For a discussion of some of the non-decisional dimensions of the decision making process, see work on the "garbage can model* of organizational choice." *(Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972).

administrators. Public school administrators currently are suffering through a period of intense criticism both from governmental and grass-roots sources. During such a period, allowing others to become involved in decision making processes can be an effective way of sharing some of the blame when things go wrong. One Utah elementary school principal found that a new system of shared decision making at his school had unanticipated benefits (Ivins, 1979):

> I did feel threatened by the new system because I could no longer make decisions on my own.... But [now] I find it an advantage in that if a parent calls me on a decision, ... I can say, "Look, all of us made the decision, here's the discussion we had on it and here are our reasons."

Thus, the desire to find ways to diffuse some of the blame for the school's mistakes may help to explain not only the push for teacher decision making involvement, but also the contemporary trend toward the establishment of school site councils and community advisory groups.

Despite the preceding three reasons why administrators may find it in their best interests to encourage some degree of teacher involvement in school decision making, relatively few schools seem to have experimented with shared decision making. Of those that have, instances of high levels of teacher involvement are the exception rather than the rule. The question remains, "What factors account for the low level of teacher involvement in and influence over school decision making?" We now explore possible answers to this question.

Explaining the Absence of Teacher Involvement

Any effort to account for the lack of greater teacher involvement and influence must recognize the likelihood that there is no single or simple

explanation. An appreciation of this probability can be gained by a brief review of the ways that researchers from different disciplines look at decision making. There are at least three major traditions of decision making research, each with several variants.

Psychologists have focused on how individuals receive and process the information which leads to decisions and the extent to which individual differences influence decision making. An application of psychological paradigms to the current investigation might entail comparing the characteristics of educators who make and who do not make school decisions. An attempt then could be made to determine whether the two groups differed significantly on certain characteristics. The outcome might be an experimental intervention in which the non-decision-makers would be trained to become involved in decision making. The assumption underlying such an intervention would be that psychological factors, such as self-efficacy, are preventing certain individuals from participating in decision making.

Other researchers suggest that factors external to the individual inhibit involvement. For example, political scientists focus on the factors that are required to get a decision made and implemented. These factors encompass power distribution, lobbying by interest groups, and coalition formation. Political scientists tend to assume that individuals rarely make decisions alone. Hence, they endeavor to identify those groups whose interests would be helped or threatened by a particular decision. In the case of shared decision making for teachers, the groups that might be affected by such a move include not only teachers, administrators, and students, but professional organizations, business interests in the community, public agencies that deal with schools, and, perhaps, local political parties.

The third set of researchers that looks at decision making is made up primarily of sociologists and organizational theorists, although some psychologists and social psychologists also are represented. These individuals tend to believe that the behavior of persons and groups is influenced greatly, if not determined altogether, by characteristics of the organizations in which they live, work, and play. Their efforts to explain the lack of greater teacher involvement would concentrate on the structural features of schools that tend to inhibit shared decision making.

The remainder of this section explores these three perspectives on decision making. Each has something unique to offer and we feel that an understanding of constructs such as involvement and influence best can be understood by drawing on all three.

A Psychological Perspective

One of the arguments which researchers working in the psychological tradition might advance is that teachers are not more involved because, for one reason or another, they do not want to be more involved. Does any evidence exist to support such an arguemnt?

The answer is yes and no. In the first place, a review of the literature indicates that the people pressing administrators to share authority with teachers usually are not rank and file teachers, but instead include teacher educators, researchers, top-level administrators, and association or union leaders. An illustrative exhortation comes from Maxine Greene (1978, p. 35), a well-known professor at Teachers College:

> I want to see teachers become challengers and take the initiative upon themselves [to create that public space between themselves where freedom could appear].

> As they do so, as we do so, there will emerge a "public space" where personal reality can be at last affirmed.

Because classroom teachers usually do not write about their feelings or publish their demands, however, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not teachers actually do desire greater involvement in school decision making.

Evidence from educational research is somewhat mixed. Alutto and Belasco (1972) focus on the variable "decisional participation," which they posit represents the difference between the number of decisions in which an individual wants to participate and the number of decisions in which he or she actually participates. They found that teachers could be grouped into three categories: those who were not participating as much as they wanted (decisional deprivation), those who were participating about as much as they wanted (decisional equilibrium), and those who were participating more than they wanted (decisional saturation). Most teachers fell into the last two categories. Those teachers who desired greater general involvement in decision making tended to be male, younger, less senior, subject to greater role conflict, and based in rural secondary schools. Alutto and Belasco did not distinguish between classroom and school decision making.

In the collection of baseline data for the Teacher Involvement Project (Emrick and Peterson, 1978), it was found that 94% of the teachers surveyed supported the goal of faculty involvement in school governance. This finding seems to contradict the results of the previous study. Teachers claimed that the benefits of greater involvement included a heightened sense of professionalism, development of a community spirit, and enhanced teacher effectiveness. Corwin's study (1970) of midwest high school

teachers supports the TIP data. He reported that the majority of the 1500 teachers believed they should exercise the ultimate authority over major educational decisions. A large sample of Ontario Teachers (Adams, et al., 1976, p. 87) indicated that a majority desired greater involvement in deciding how to spend the school budget and hiring new staff members. Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) found that teachers did desire greater participation in decision making, but in areas in which they reported deriving little satisfaction from participation! The authors (Duke, Showers, and Imber, 1979) report elsewhere that teachers in a sample of five urban secondary schools identified both costs and benefits of involvement in school decision making.

Problems with each of the studies cited above prevent the drawing of conclusions with any measure of confidence. The data typically are reported in such a way as to make it difficult to determine whether teachers desire involvement in some kinds of school decisions but not others. None of the studies provided for the collection of ongoing observational data to help check on the stability, over time, of teacher or principal self-reports. All that can be said on the basis of these studies is that some teachers express interest in participating in decision making.

If there is some interest in shared decision making on the part of some teachers, what psychological reasons might explain their lack of involvement?

Contentment. One argument is that the research suggesting some teachers desire involvement is misleading and that despite what they say teachers basically are content with the status quo. In this view, surveying teachers on whether they desire decision making authority may be analagous to asking middle class people if they brush their teeth.

When asked if they support teacher involvement in school decision making, most teachers may feel constrained to reply in the affirmative. Shared decision making, after all, has been a longstanding goal of teacher groups. Failure to give it public support could be perceived as being opposed to teacher professionalism. Privately, though, many teachers may believe they are having a sufficient impact on decision making through their organizations and the collective bargaining process.

While once local chapters of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers bargained mostly for salaries and benefits, recent years have found both groups pressing to have more issues related to "working conditions" brought to the negotiation tables. Teacher organizations sometimes caution their members to be careful about committing their own time and energy to school decision making, particularly when they do not receive remuneration. Organization leaders point out that it is easier for administrators to control individual teachers involved in decision making than it is to control representatives of the association or union.

Loss of autonomy. Despite an interest in school decision making, many teachers may fear that greater involvement could jeopardize their autonomy in the classroom. Although teachers sometimes complain that they feel isolated, isolation may not always be undesirable. Low visibility and lack of collegial interaction conceivably can enhance teacher authority over classroom decision making. One of the few studies to address this issue failed to confirm the argument, however. In comparing schools with and without team planning, Schmuck, Paddock, and Packard (1977) report that teachers in team situations did not indicate an appreciable loss of autonomy. Still, those who have not experimented with

teaming or some other form of shared decision making may continue to perceive such involvement as a threat to their authority.

Unprepared for leadership. Psychologists focus considerable attention on learning and the impact of training on behavior. A third reason why teachers may not be more involved in school decision making could derive from their lack of training in the exercise of organizational leadership. In other words, teachers simply may never have learned (or been taught) to think of themselves as school decision makers. This argument is buttressed by the realization that most teachers are women. Until recently, society has tended not to encourage women to pursue positions of leadership. In addition, what teachers learn in the typical teacher training program and in their first teaching experiences tends to reinforce the notion of the school as a hierarchical authority system.

Spillane and Levinson (1976, p. 439) see the problem stemming from both teacher education and teacher organizations:

> One of the skills notably neglected in education courses is that of performing as a member of a staff. The result is that many teachers revert to the patterns of childhood, either accepting the administrator's word as law or rebelling endlessly against authority. Teachers' organizations reinforce these attitudes by seeing their role as that of protector against exploitation. They have not fought to have their members included in the decision-making process in the schools.

In light of these observations, it may not be surprising that Halpin (1966, p. 178) finds many teachers prefer to be told what to do and how to do it rather than taking the initiative themselves.

In describing teachers' seeming lack of initiative, Sarason (1971, p. 160) makes the following observation:

> What I think deserves special emphasis is the difficulty many teachers had in verbalizing their resentment about having little or nothing to say about

> decisions that could or would affect their work. It may well be that this difficulty in recognizing and verbalizing resentment reflects the degree to which teachers are accustomed to being treated as lowly proletariats.

Lortie (1975, p. 185) supports this view, claiming that,

> Teachers seem to want conditions which favor more control over student involvement, more discretion to make decisions, and greater trust from principals and parents. Yet one senses a reluctance to press the case to its logical extreme; it is as if these teachers half accept and half reject the limitations imposed by their status.

Both Lortie and Sarason tend to see teacher reluctance to press for greater involvement more as a function of their status than a product of their training, but it is impossible to separate status from the socialization processes that characterize teacher education programs and initial classroom experiences.

Teacher naivete. Yet another reason why teachers may not press more actively for shared decision making, despite the apparent interest of some, may stem from general naivete regarding how organizations like schools function. This naivete may lead teachers to misperceive the extent of their powerlessness. They may feel they are more in control of their lives than they actually are. Teachers may not realize, for example, that, most often, whatever authority they possess is delegated authority, dependent on the whim of the principal and that delegated authority can always be withdrawn. Duke (1979), in fact, notes that there seems to have been a steady erosion of teacher authority in the area of classroom management at the very same time that demands for teachers to be in control of students and student outcomes have increased. Like the person living on an earthquake fault line, however,

teachers may not have a clear idea of what is going on around them until it is too late.

To alert new teachers to the realities of working contemporary schools, the Teacher Corps has begun to urge its interns to acquire a sound understanding of organizational theory and practice so that they will appreciate how authority is distributed and what it takes for schools to change. Teachers-in-training are encouraged to divest themselves of any illusions they may have that "taking care of business" in their own classrooms will minimize organizational intrusions or challenges to their professional autonomy.

Organizational influence. Each of the four reasons presented above relates not only to some psychological characteristic of teachers as individuals, but also to characteristics of groups of teachers. Group behavior often is shaped by factors present in the organizations within which groups work. If, for example, teachers are content to have their professional organizations do their decision making for them or they fail to regard themselves as potential leaders, it is likely they have been influenced by the reward structure in schools and the processes by which they become socialized into the teaching role. Fear of losing autonomy and organizational naivete also may be traced to organizational forces. All of which is to say that psychologists can contribute to an understanding of teacher involvement in school decision making, but not without assistance from those who study organizational structure and its impact on individual and group behavior.[1]

---

[1]For a brief discussion of how organizational explanations are a necessary complement to psychological explanations, see Simon (1976, p. xvi).

A Political Science Perspective

A second approach to decision making comes primarily from the discipline of political science. Political scientists study such factors as spheres of influence, sources of power, and coalitions. Hanson (1978) has built a provocative conceptual model of school decision making around these factors. The following excerpt typifies a political science perspective (pp. 32-33):

> Within the spheres of influence there are formal subcoalitions which have their own objectives, members, norms, sources of power and sense of legitimacy. As the school's environment shifts between placid and turbulent, problem situations arise and different subcoalitions emerge to involve themselves in the ensuing decision-making. Sometimes several subcoalitions become differentiated and integrated as they take on a problem, and at other times they directly or indirectly combat one another. At times administrator and teacher subcoalitions join forces in making decisions, and thus bridge the separate spheres of influence, while at other times they go their separate ways.

Applying this perspective to the present concern, an argument can be made that teachers do not enjoy greater involvement in school decision making because 1) such involvement threatens the interests of other groups concerned with schooling and 2) teachers lack the power alone to achieve a desired level of involvement. This perspective sees the key to successful involvement in decision making as coalition formation (Kirst, 1978). In other words, teachers do not possess greater decision making authority because they have failed to form the coalitions necessary to force a change in the existing organizational structure of schools.

Evidence exists that other groups besides teachers have some interest in the processes by which school decisions are made. Foremost among these groups--which include taxpayers, certain business interests, students,

and cultural groups--are parents. The recent history of conflict between teachers and local communities dates from the Ocean Hill-Brownsville disputes in the sixties. A major concern at that time involved the presence of predominantly white, Jewish faculties in predominantly black, Christian schools. At issue was who would influence educational decision making.

Since then, a number of developments have taken place, including efforts to decentralize several large school systems and give local communities more of a voice in school affairs. Some parents, dissatisfied with their lack of power, have become active in establishing and supporting alternative schools (Duke, 1978b). Groups advocating parent interests have emerged. One such organization, the Institute for Responsive Education, actively seeks to foster local school councils that function as "effective vehicles for citizens to affect educational policies and decisions" (Davies, undated, p. 6). A big step in this direction has been taken in California, where legislation was enacted providing technical and financial support to local councils interested in school improvement. Recently, Coons and Sugarman (1978) have employed legalistic arguments to urge greater parental involvement in educational decision making. Borrowing from European political philosophers, they argue for adoption of a policy of <u>subsidiarity</u>, which holds that "responsibility for dependent individuals should belong to the smaller and more intimate rather than the larger and more anonymous communities to which the individual belongs" (p. 49). They go on to point out a fallacy in the contemporary argument by educators against greater parental influence (P. 51):

> The question is not whether the judgment of the isolated and unassisted family is superior to the profes-

> sional cadre of a school or a district. It is rather, when all available knowledge, personal and professional, about the particular child is assembled, to whom shall society commit the final choice?

Coons and Sugarman, along with many others, clearly believe that the final choice must rest with the family, not the teachers.

Does increased parental involvement in educational decision making necessarily imply a lessening of teacher authority? Can it be assumed that parental and professional conceptions of what is in the best interests of young people inevitably differ?

In reality, teachers often express great interest in involving parents more actively in the educational enterprise. If they balk at the thought of giving parents extensive decision making authority, it may be due to the simple fact that teachers themselves lack such authority, at least at the school level. Theoretically, though, parents and teachers could form effective coalitions to press for change. Of course, theory and practice often are separated by formidable organizational factors. One such factor is the way the principal's role is conceived.

It can be argued that school administrators benefit directly from situations in which teachers and parents compete for involvement in school decision making. By pursuing, or at least accepting, a divide and rule policy, administrators can maintain their own authority and function as power brokers. For more than a century, a similar policy prevented coalitions of poor white and poor black farmers in the South from forming against the economic elite.

Whether administrators actually conspire to keep teachers and parents from allying is uncertain. Unfortunately, most of the research on coalition formation in education has focused on the district, state or

federal rather than the single school level. However, in assessing the success of school councils, Davies and his colleagues (undated, p. 47) note that some principals "are willing to have councils spend inordinate amounts of time on minor organizational issues." They conclude that most lack the power to address the most substantive policy decisions (p. 42).

In summary, the argument of political scientists that lack of greater teacher involvement in school decision making can be understood by studying the groups competing for a share of the authority is helpful, but, as in the previous case, somewhat incomplete. Organizational, as well as psychological, factors influence the distribution of power and the processes by which coalitions are formed. For example, if few opportunities for teachers and parents to discuss common concerns are built into the basic school calendar, the likelihood that these two groups will come to understand each other and possibly join together to press for school improvements is slight. Teachers and parents simply have too little time--unless a crisis arises--to assume the initiative for scheduling such interactions.

Before moving on to discuss organizational factors affecting teacher involvement, it is important to explain the omission of any discussion of macro-level, socioeconomic factors. Political economists argue persuasively that these factors exert considerable influence on who makes which decisions. Probably many of the same forces which prevent or retard greater teacher involvement also operate to keep workers in general from enjoying more of a voice in workplace decision making. However, it is difficult to begin an analysis of a particular group of workers (teachers) and its relationship to the authority structure of the workplace by focusing on society-wide factors. As in photography, if the focus is too broad, clarity and definition are lost. The authors feel that the organization--in this

case the school--is a more useful unit of analysis for exploratory investigations of the present variety. Such a focus need not exclude, though, the likely link between how organizations are structured and how society is structured.

Sociology and Organizational Theory

As the last two sections suggest, we believe that organizational characteristics of schools are essential in explaining why teachers are not more involved or influential in school decision making. Where other factors exert an influence, they tend to derive from or be mediated by aspects of the organization. This section will concentrate on some of the organizational characteristics which may serve to prevent or retard shared decision making.

Katz and Kahn (1978, p. 711) identify three aspects of organizational structure that are crucial to organizational change. These include:

1. The division of labor
2. The reward structure
3. The authority structure

Changes in each factor probably should be considered by anyone interested in increasing worker involvement and influence.

Division of labor. Most schools are characterized by a division of teacher labor along grade and, in secondary schools, subject matter lines. Only in the handful of remaining one-room schoolhouses, some alternative schools, and few open-space facilities can teachers be found whose jobs span multi-age groupings, different subjects, and responsibilities ranging from instruction to administration. Teachers seem to have suffered the same fate as other workers, a fate well-described by Braverman (1974, p. 4):

> ...work has become increasingly subdivided into petty operations that fail to sustain the interest or engage the capacities of humans with current levels of education; that these petty operations demand ever less skill and training; and that the modern trend of work by its "mindlessness" and "bureaucratization" is "alienating" ever larger sections of the working population.

Along with alienation, the division of labor tends to foster separation of labor, with the result that most teachers work in self-contained classrooms isolated from their colleagues.

Being architecturally divided from each other as well as divided in terms of responsibilities, teachers tend to rely on administrators for coordination, support, technical assistance, and evaluative feedback. Teachers are socialized into thinking that as long as they maintain their own classrooms, they have discharged their primary responsibility. Over time a teacher begins to believe that his or her own classroom concerns are somehow unique and that colleagues, as well as other potential resource persons, have little knowledge or expertise to contribute to the improvement of performance. It is not surprising that teacher involvement in school decision making is hardly facilitated by the present system of division of labor or its by-products.

In situations where an effort has been made to modify the division of labor--through team teaching or team planning--results suggest that feelings of interdependence grow. Marram, Dornbusch, and Scott (1972) found that teaming increased teacher visibility of each other's work and led to an increase in the perceived validity of collegial opinion. Meyer and Cohen (1971) reported that open-space schools (in which self-contained classrooms were eliminated) were characterized by greater feelings of group influence and autonomy by teachers and more teacher interaction.

The above studies indicate that, at least for elementary schools, changes in the division and the separation of labor can directly and indirectly stimulate greater teacher involvement and influence. Katz and Kahn (1978, pp. 700-701) offer other recommendations that can correct the negative impact of division of labor. These include job enlargement ("an addition of activities to an existing work role") and job enrichment ("the addition of activities that make the work more interesting and intrinsically motivating"). The assumption underlying the suggestions is that workers are unlikely to become active participants in organizational decision making as long as they see themselves functioning in narrow areas of specialization with little to gain from collegial contact.

Reward structure. All organizations embody a reward structure consisting of certain generally recognized benefits and costs. Theorists maintain that organization members are motivated to work by the prospect of achieving these benefits or avoiding costs. Presumably, then, if teachers are not involved extensively in decision making, one reason may be that the benefits for such involvement are too meager, the costs too dear, or both.

Observation in schools and discussions with teachers (Duke, Showers, and Imber, 1979) indicate that few extrinsic rewards are available to those who become highly involved in school decision making. Typically there are no salary inducements, allocations of released time, or special training. Instead, teachers rely on intrinsic motivators, such as a spirit of loyalty to their school, teaching specialty, or students.

The teacher who decides to become involved in school decision making often learns quickly that the costs of such involvement may not be offset by the personal satisfaction or feelings of authority that accrue. At least five general types of costs can be identified: increased time demands, loss of autonomy, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of

collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement.

While many people debate the precise parameters of the decision making process, few dispute the fact that participation requires considerable time. Time spent participating in one activity is time not spent on some other activity. Specifically, for teachers, time devoted to participating in decision making processes is time not devoted to "teaching" activities--preparing and leading classes, grading papers, counseling students, advising extra-curricular activities. If teaching activities required only a fixed expenditure of time, it would be possible for teachers to choose to spend time on school decision making in addition to other professional activities. But, by its very nature, teaching is a job in which there is always more that can be done. Teachers commonly complain that they do not have sufficient time to accomplish all that they wish. In other words, the time which they deem available for all job-related activities (time not spent on personal activities) is already insufficient. For teachers to choose to devote some of their scarce professional time to participate in school decision making, they would have to view such participation as more rewarding than the performance of a teaching activity. There is reason to believe, however, that most teachers view teaching activities--especially working directly with students--as the most rewarding aspect of their job.

Lortie (1975) offers support for the contention that teachers consider their primary benefits to derive from classroom work and contacts with students rather than other professional activities. "It is of great importance to teachers to feel they have 'reached' their students--their core rewards are tied to that perception.... Other sources of satisfaction (e.g., private scholarly activities, relationships with

adults) pale in comparison with teachers' exchanges with students and the feeling that students have learned." (p. 106).

It is true that often new programs in which shared decision making is a primary component promise to produce improvements in classroom outcomes. Over the years, however, teachers have grown suspicious of these claims. Teachers frequently have discovered that innovations called for ever-increasing commitments of out-of-class time and yielded too little in the way of demonstrable classroom benefits (Duke, 1978b). Thus, teachers might not view participation in school decision making as a particularly desirable activity unless they judge that a specific shared decision making scheme has great potential for improvement of classroom life and student outcomes.

In addition to concern over time expenditures, teachers might fear that shared decision making may cost them a measure of autonomy. On the surface, this contention perhaps appears odd. Teacher involvement in school decision making, after all, is supposed to represent a means by which teachers can gain a greater voice in determining how schools are run. In reality, though, individual teachers--long accustomed to a relatively large measure of self-determination in their self-contained classrooms--might sense that autonomy could be jeopardized as more decisions were shifted to a group setting. In other words, teachers as a group might gain influence as a result of shared decision making, but at the expense of individual teachers. Support for this argument comes from the literature on professionalism. Myers (1973, p. 17) writes that "the authority of the practitioner to follow his own dictates rather than being constrained by a superior, or even colleagues, is a basic characteristic of professionals" (italics added). Shared decision making

could be regarded as a step backwards by some teachers who seek full professional status.

Furthermore, many of the new thrusts toward more collaborative school decision making have called for the active involvement of parents, community members, and students as well as teachers. For example, a number of recent federally and state funded programs have mandated the establishment of school site councils and advisory boards with varied constituencies. Thus, teachers face the prospect of sharing their traditional authority over classrooms with non-teachers as well as colleagues. No longer would teachers be protected from the community by school administrators. School site management exposes them to direct review and criticism by laymen. These factors might cause some teachers to view loss of autonomy as a potential cost of involvement in decision making.

Goode (1979) maintains that the respect of a person's peers is one of the most desirable benefits an individual can gain in contemporary society. Teachers may have reason to fear that involvement in school decision making is not a pathway to collegial respect. Some teachers have been observed to be suspicious of colleagues who identified too closely with the school authority structure. A recent letter from a frustrated teacher to the Kappan Counselor captures some of the dilemma faced by teachers interested in exercising leadership (Phi Delta Kappan, February 1979, p. 467):

> Dear Counselor:
>
> In our high school the principal's policy in securing department chairpersons is to allow each department to elect its own. The opportunity for leadership and professional growth this position offers appeal strongly to me. But after running and losing three times now, I'm convinced my department won't elect me (and I can't transfer to another school).

> The majority of our department (English/drama about 14 people) are, frankly, casual about their responsibilities. They put in minimum time, do not assign much writing, and are prone to joking and complaining at department meetings.
>
> I have never argued with any of the members over our differences, but they surely see the effort and time I put in. Nevertheless, I believe I am friendly on a daily basis and do not indulge in any "holier than thou" remarks. In fact, I consider these people my friends. So why can't I get elected? The department head does participate in evaluation of both probationary and permanent teachers. Are they afraid I would give critical evaluations? Should I relax my standards to get elected?

One reason that efforts by individual teachers to exercise leadership or become involved in school decision making could stimulate unfavorable reactions from colleagues is the fear that such action might lead to co-optation by the administration. This fear might not be completely unwarranted. The delegation of authority to subordinates has long been considered a basic means by which managers maintain control (March and Simon, 1958, pp. 40-41). In reality, it is probably easier for administrators to control the behavior of influential teachers when they are part of the legitimate school authority structure than when they remain outside it.

A primary way in which contemporary teachers have exercised influence while remaining outside the traditional school authority structure has been through involvement in teacher associations and unions. The advent of collective bargaining for teachers in many states has meant that teachers potentially can exert an impact on working conditions and school policy without joining school advisory councils or risking administrative co-optation. Some concern exists among union leaders that any extensive involvement of individual teachers in shared decision making at the

school level could jeopardize the collective bargaining position of teachers at the district level. Conceivably, some administrators may regard shared decision making as a means to circumvent the yearly negotiations process and keep school decisions under their direct supervision. It is noteworthy that the American Federation of Teachers has opposed many efforts to decentralize educational decision making, such as school site budgeting and community involvement in policy-making.[1]

Because of the belief that a strong profession is one in which all members share a common professional identity, many teachers' organizations also have resisted efforts to establish differentiated staffing, multiple wage scales, and merit pay--each of which could provide concrete inducements for greater teacher leadership and involvement in school decision making. As a result of their successful fight to maintain a single wage scale for teachers in the same district, teacher organizations have largely prevented school administrators from exercising control over teacher behavior through the manipulation of economic rewards. Efforts to decentralize decision making and to involve teachers as individuals rather than as representatives of a united profession thus could be regarded as threats to the current position of strength enjoyed by teacher organizations.

A final reason why involvement in school decision making might be perceived by some teachers as costly is a concern that such participation could jeopardize their opportunity to get a more desirable position or become an administrator. School administrators are often selected from the ranks of classroom teachers. It is conceivable that some teachers

---

[1]Our appreciation to Professor Michael Kirst of Stanford University and to Roslyn Herman of the New York State Unified Teachers for this information.

would believe that keeping an orderly classroom and maintaining a low profile are important factors in determining which teachers are seriously considered for administrative openings. Anderson (1968, p. 30) has noted this possibility in his analysis of school bureaucracy:

> Since effective teaching performance is difficult to measure, rewards and promotions must be based on seniority and on the judgment of superiors to a greater extent than in other professions. A teacher concerned about his career will minimize his area of individual responsibility when there is any possibility of incurring the displeasure of his superiors. Minimizing responsibility is a way of protecting oneself and ensuring a favorable report by supervisors and principals.

Involvement in school decision making could increase the likelihood that a teacher might become known as a troublemaker or a malcontent. Teachers who seek career advancement might simply avoid such situations and bide their time until an administrative opening appears.

Authority structure. The authority structure of most schools centers around the role of the principal. House and Capan (1978, p. 32) contend,

> The principal's authority in the school has not really been challenged, even in recent years. Each teacher confronts the principal as an individual and tries to negotiate the best classroom support she can muster. Each differs in the deal he or she makes, but the individualistic orientation of teachers does not challenge the power of the principal to run the whole school.

This section of the paper argues that the "individualistic orientation of teachers" is derived, in large measure, from the nature of the school authority structure and, in particular, the role filled by the principal.

Principals are expected to be in charge. Parents, students, central office personnel, board members, and often teachers themselves look to the principal for leadership and guidance. These expectations may derive more from the force of tradition (it's the way schools always have been

run) than from any proven superiority of the hierarchical model of school decision making. In any event, Krasnow (1978) reports that teachers working with poor and/or minority students are particularly concerned that principals exhibit "highly structured, organized leader behavior."

Principals are in a unique position to influence school decision making, a fact many teachers readily acknowledge when they say that, no matter what they recommend or do, the principal will have the last word. Principals' schedules are characterized by more unallocated time than teachers', permitting them to become engaged in decision making without loss of instructional time. They have access to more information of potential use in decision making than do teachers, largely because they monitor all phases of school operations. As a result, principals often appear to have more knowledgeable input to contribute to decision making, thus discouraging some teachers from actively participating. Principals typically are responsible for setting the agendas for faculty meetings--a function that means they can decide which decisions will be made and when. They also tend to set the guidelines upon which decision making will be based. Hanson (1978, p. 31) contends that principals have a repertoire of tactics they can employ to maintain their authority:

> The administrators' tactics of defending their domains against a perceived outside intrusion attempt ... fell into the following patterns: 1) ignore it, decide not to decide and hope the proposal dies a natural death; 2) delay it, leave the proposal off the agenda of the faculty meeting; 3) study it, form a study committee and pack it with sympathetic members; 4) buck it, pass the buck upward and claim the superintendent won't support such a proposal; 5) publicly support it, privately use a pocket veto.

Finally, it is in the principal's best interests--materially and otherwise--to see that school decision making is effective and representative

of his or her policies. In other words, the benefits for principals who exercise their authority over decision making are clearer and more extrinsic than the rewards available to teachers for involvement.

Some researchers (Schmuck, Paddock, and Packard, 1977; Thomas, 1978) argue that the attitudes or personalities (idiosyncratic factors) of particular principals can be as important in accounting for between-school differences in teacher involvement or influence as aspects of their formal role (nomothetic factors). For example, principals who believe more in democratic governance would be expected to encourage a greater amount of shared decision making. Bridges (1964) conducted a study, however, in which he failed to support the hypothesis that principals with open belief systems provide for a significantly greater amount of teacher participation in decision making than principals with closed belief systems. While level of teacher participation was not found to be related to principal's belief system, it did vary with school size, as well as the age and experience of the principal.

Summary. So far the paper has suggested that 1) teachers do not seem to exert much influence over school decision making nor are they highly involved in the process and 2) this situation can best be understood by combining the perspectives of psychologists, political scientists, sociologists, and organization theorists. While teachers clearly have no desire to commit large amounts of time and energy to school decision making, neither are they content to be completely without influence over the nature of their work or the setting in which it takes place.

The question that arises at this point is "Under what circumstances would teachers be most likely to exercise leadership at the school level?" Schlechty (1976, pp. 31-32) addresses this question directly,

though he does not answer it:

> ... there exists in educational research considerable ambiguity in teachers' leadership functions. On the one hand, in the hierarchical arrangement of most schools the leadership potential of the position of teacher is limited by subordinate relationship to the positions of principal, supervisor, and superintendent .... On the other hand, the fact that one of the prime functions of teachers is to influence students to behave in organizationally desired ways forces the impression that teaching is somehow a leadership function.

It seems that considerable confusion surrounds the issue of how much involvement and influence teachers desire or are expected to have by administrators. It is likely that any generalizations about what teachers as a group want are inappropriate. As Alutto and Belasco (1972) and the authors (Duke, Showers, and Imber, 1979) have shown, teachers differ in their desires for involvement. As for the wishes of administrators, all that can be said of a general nature is that few expect teachers either to take over school management completely or to remain totally uninvolved in school operations.

The following section suggests that the lack of certainty regarding the role of professionals, such as teachers, in bureaucratic organizations, such as schools, serves to heighten the sense of confusion surrounding the issue of teacher involvement in school decision making. Any effort to rethink school organization in the hopes of moving toward some form of workplace democracy for teachers must confront this problem.

Professionals in Bureaucracies

Anderson (1968, p. vii) notes that professional activities increasingly are being conducted within complex organizations which are bureaucratically organized. An indication of the difficulties of studying this trend in the sphere of education is the fact that no concensus exists 1) that teachers

are professionals or 2) that schools are bureaucracies. While recognizing that teachers may not be as fully professionalized as physicians or lawyers, the authors consider teachers to be more like professionals than any other category of workers. In addition, schools, though they vary in administrative details from one site to the next, seem to be organized essentially along bureaucratic lines.

Corwin (1970) finds that schools differ in the extent to which they are bureaucratized, however. In the most bureaucratized schools, a strong sense of professionalism among teachers is more likely to lead to conflict than in less bureaucratized schools. Corwin feels some conflict is almost inevitable if teachers are to become fully professionalized. This feeling is based on the assumption that full professionalization for teachers requires an absolute gain in authority of teachers relative to administrative authority.

Moeller (1964) reports that teachers' sense of power is greater in more highly bureaucratized schools. In trying to account for this unexpected finding, he states (pp. 153-154):

> It seems apparent in the low bureaucracy schools that nearly everyone--teachers, parents, and the general public--has access to the administrative policy-makers on a friendship basis.... This, in effect, tends to devalue this avenue, for if everyone has access, then all should benefit equally.... Only in an orderly, understandable, and predictable [i.e., a highly bureaucratized] organization can any individual expect to influence the direction the organization will take.

Authority relates directly to the issue of who influences school decision making. Educators frequently debate which decisions are best influenced by teachers and which by administrators. Areas such as the curriculum may seem to fall more naturally within the domain of teacher expertise than matters involving personnel or school rules. Yet,

even in curriculum, no clear division of decision making responsibilities exists. Teachers have been forced to compete not only with administrators, but also with community representatives, publishers, state legislatures, university professors and government agencies in an effort to determine what will be taught.

A professional, according to Scott (1966), derives authority from superior competence rather than occupancy of a particular organizational position. This fact, however, does not help to clarify where teacher decision making influence should abate and administrator influence commence, since practically all school administrators can claim to have been teachers at one point. As a result, they can argue that they possess as much technical expertise--except that which is subject matter specific--as any teacher.

Scott (1966) contends that uncertainty over the responsibilities of professionals in bureaucratic organizations leads to four areas of role conflict:

1. The professional's resistance to bureaucratic rules.
2. The professional's rejection of bureaucratic standards.
3. The professional's resistance to bureaucratic supervision.
4. The professional's conditional loyalty to the bureaucracy.

Despite Moeller's previously cited study, evidence of each of these areas of role conflict can be found in most schools. Duke (1978a), for example, has found that, in the area of school discipline, teachers do not always enforce general rules governing student behavior. Those who have observed in schools also acknowledge that teachers frequently reject certain organizational standards (such as how to measure student achievement or

how to relate to students), resent being supervised or evaluated, and owe their primary allegiance to students or subject matter specialty rather than the school.

It would be a mistake, though, to interpret this teacher behavior as an indication that, as professionals, they invariably shun all constraints, rules, norms, or standards. Schlechty (1976, p. 90) points out,

> Professionalism is not necessarily synonymous with "every one doing his own thing." Professionalism does not mean the absence of rules, sanctions, and norms for performance. Rather, it means that the rules, sanctions, and norms derive from some assumed basis of knowledge and expertise instead of being allocated to particular positions within the organization. The professional is autonomous only insofar as the norms, values, and performance standards of the profession are not violated.

Both the teaching profession and the school as a public organization embody sets of norms, values, and performance standards. These often differ. A logical place to resolve such differences is at the level of school decision making. As this paper has maintained, however, teachers, for a variety of reasons, have not been full participants in school decision making. Thus, role confusion and conflict continue to exist in most schools without opportunities built into the authority structure for teachers and administrators to clear up the problems.

Initially, we proposed the philosophical argument that teachers have a right to workplace democracy--in other words, to be involved in school decision making affecting what they do, and when, how, and where they do it. Now we have proposed that greater teacher involvement also could lead to a resolution of the confusion surrounding the role of a professional teacher in an essentially bureaucratic school. Realistically, though, we must admit that substantive structural changes in complex organizations rarely result entirely from philosophical arguments about rights

or from the need to clear up role confusion. Basic changes in organizational authority structures seem to be considered seriously only when the existence of the organization is threatened or the promise exists of greater productivity. Galbraith (1977, p. 45) captures the essence of this contention in the following comment:

> Professionalization by itself may not be sufficient to shift decision making to lower levels of the organization. The reason is that, in the presence of interdependence, an alternative which is based on professional or craft standards may not be best for the whole organization. Thus, alternatives which are preferred from a local or departmental perspective may not be preferred from a global perspective. The product design that is technically preferred may not be preferred by the customer, may be too costly to be produced, or may require a schedule which takes too long to complete.

The next section thus looks at the recent literature on decision making to assess the likelihood that greater teacher involvement in school decision making might yield better educational outcomes.

Teacher Decision Making and Productivity

In thinking about productivity in education, a distinction needs to be made between student outcomes and teacher outcomes. Student outcomes--such as academic achievement, socially desirable behavior, and self-esteem -- represent the primary goals of schooling. Many people believe that accomplishing the primary goals of any production process can be enhanced by attending to the needs of the workers. Thus, certain teacher outcomes--notably job satisfaction, mental health, and collegialism--may be regarded as secondary goals of schooling, potentially contributing to the achievement of primary goals.

Student Outcomes

Surprisingly, given all the discussion of shared decision making in schools, there is very little research linking measures of teacher involvement or influence to measures of student outcomes. Studies in the area tend to relate teacher involvement to teacher outcomes (secondary goals). For some reason, perhaps political or pragmatic, those who investigate teacher decision making have concentrated more on its impact on teachers than on students.

Nickse (1977) maintains, without the aid of empirical support, that teachers are logical candidates for leadership roles in schoolwide efforts to improve student outcomes. She points out that teachers have a vested interest in the success of the schooling enterprise, they identify with the system and have a sense of pre-history about the school organization, they often live in the communities in which they teach, and they are constantly on the scene in the schools. Nickse seems to be calling for greater decentralization of educational decision making, an objective which finds many supporters. Coons and Sugarman (1978, p. 46) caution, however, that decentralization does not necessarily result in decisions being made that are "optimally designed to benefit the individual child."

Research that addresses the relationship between teacher decison making and student outcomes has tended to concentrate on the classroom, rather than the school. For example, Floden (1978a; 1978b) and others at Michigan State are studying influences on course content selection. They speculate that teachers have the final word on the content presented to pupils. Teacher decisions about what content to present are felt to determine to a large extent the pattern of student achievement.

McDonald (1976), in summarizing the results of the ETS Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, provides indirect support for this contention,

though he points out that the impact of greater teacher decision making involvement may not always be positive. Using multivariate analysis, McDonald's group found that the degree of centralization of curriculum decision making predicted teaching styles in classrooms, which in turn predicted student achievement in second and fifth grade reading and mathematics. He suggests that the relationship between teacher involvement in school decision-making and student achievement is quite complex, however -- varying with grade level, subject matter, and type of instructional grouping.

In studies on the training and utilization of teacher aides, Zax and Cowen (1967) found that, when teachers participate in making decisions concerning the use of aides, students benefit.

While teacher involvement in decision making concerning curriculum content and teacher aides may contribute, under certain circumstances, to positive student outcomes, there is reason to wonder about the impact of such involvement in the area of school discipline. Corwin (197), pp. 120-125) found that schools with a higher degree of centralized decision making (high bureaucratic schools) tended to have fewer student behavior problems. From the description of Corwin's research, however, it is difficult to separate out the possible effects of organizational centralization from other factors, including student body and faculty characteristics, that also could contribute to the level of discipline problems at a particular school.

Teacher Outcomes

Research on the relationship between teacher involvement and teacher outcomes is more plentiful than studies linking involvement to student outcomes. Concern over teacher outcomes stems, in part, from the work of human-relations theorists who are as committed to the emotional health and well-being of workers as to productivity. Galbraith (1977) offers a typical

reaction of such a theorist to advocates of classical management. He addresses himself specifically to the negative impact of division of labor (p. 14):

> The first problem was the possibility of motivational limitations on efficiency. Once the task has been divided into pieces and the planning and control decisions taken away, have we not created a situation which deprives individuals of any personal work satisfaction? What will motivate them to assume such roles and devote their time and energy to the subtask? If decisions are made by individuals who do not perform the work, why will the doers adopt behaviors selected for them by others?

Vavrus (1978) does a fine job reviewing the literature on teacher job satisfaction and pointing out how complex this construct can be. Job satisfaction involves mental health, motivational, and morale factors. In his own research, Vavrus finds that recently trained teachers enter the profession expecting a higher degree of decision making involvement than their more experienced colleagues report. The latter group reflect a higher degree of alienation from their work, a disturbing finding given the fact that seniority is supposed to yield a greater job satisfaction and influence. It appears that teaching may not necessarily hold out the promise of increased authority to those who choose to make it a career.

Where teachers are given an opportunity to participate in school decision making, there are indications that they experience greater job satisfaction and higher morale (Vavrus, 1978, p. 40). Carpenter (1971) looked at schools with different organizational structures and found that teacher job satisfaction was greatest where there were the fewest "layers" of authority. In the final evaluation of the Teacher Involvement Project, Emrick and Peterson (1978) state that teachers listed the following benefits of their involvement in school decision making: improved staff morale, increased communications with administrators and district office, more efficient use of meeting time,

better sense of professionalism and job satisfaction, and protection of teacher interests. Bridges (1964) found that teachers' attitudes toward principals were more favorable where opportunities for their participation were greater. Meyer and Cohen (1971) concluded that if teachers are made to feel more powerful they will experience higher morale, which, in turn, will reduce the likelihood of teachers dropping out of the profession.

Despite these indications of positive teacher outcomes, there are reasons for exercising care in claiming universal benefits from shared decision making. The body of research on the subject, though growing, still does not constitute a sizable enough collection to permit generalizations to be made. As with any well-intentioned innovation, shared decision making conceivably can produce negative by-products (Duke, 1977c). No one, for instance, has systematically investigated the possibility that the time required for teachers to become involved in school decision making may result in less time spent on instruction or instructional planning, which in turn may contribute to decreased student achievement. Another possibility is that teachers, because they tend to function in isolation, may be poorly suited to school decision making. In other words, they may be unable to rise above the parochial interests of their individaul classrooms.

Some of the existing research reinforces the need for caution in predicting the benefits of shared decision making. Schmuck, Paddock, and Packard (1977) found that job satisfaction was slightly greater among teachers in schools where collaborative decision making did not occur regularly. Currently this group is trying to determine if their finding can be explained by problems in the process by which the experimental (unit) and control (non-unit) schools were selected. Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) state that greater job satisfaction for teachers results from participation in

making only certain kinds of decisions. Teachers reported greater satisfaction from involvement in technical decision making (decisions related to instructional role) than from managerial or negotiation decision making. Deal, Intili, Rosaler, and Stockhouse (1977), in a study of the impact of California's Early Childhood Education program (the precursor of the School Improvement Program), note that the presence of school advisory councils and greater opportunities for teacher involvement in school decision making did not produce more collaboration or coordination. The influence of principals in the ECE schools, in fact, was perceived to be greater than in non-ECE schools!

Conclusion

It is too soon to proclaim a precise understanding of the relationship between teacher involvement in school decision making and either student or teacher outcomes. There simply are insufficient data on the subject. For one thing, the number of experiments with extensive teacher involvement has been quite small. It is still unclear how teachers would function in situations where they could share fully in making a wide range of school decisions.

At the outset of the paper the position was taken that teachers have a right to be involved in workplace decision making, at least as long as the relationship between involvement and productivity remains uncertain. Later, however, it was recognized that the realities of educational change -- at least in the United States -- seemed to preclude any significant step toward rethinking the school authority structure that was not linked to the promise of greater student outcomes. It should be added that even the promise of greater outcomes is no authomatic guarantee that a widespread shift toward workplace democracy for teachers would occur. Certain organizational and environmental forces that have functioned for years to inhibit

greater teacher involvement in school decision making probably would continue to resist any change in the status quo.

It is difficult to predict what the future holds for teachers interested in playing a more central role in the school authority structure. If the public regard for public schools plummets further, desperate school officials may become only too willing to share authority -- and blame -- with teachers. Most of what we know about school decision making has been based on periods of growth or, at least, stability. The contemporary move toward fiscal retrenchment may alter school authority structures in as yet unanticipated ways.

If teachers find they are able to obtain what they desire through the activities of their professional organizations, they may be reluctant to press for shared decision making, praticularly if the present reward structure continues to make teacher involvement more costly than beneficial. One thing seems clear, though. If teachers remain cloistered in their classrooms and refrain from demonstrating that their expertise and experience is needed to make efficacious school decisions, they will not achieve the full professional status they desire and deserve.

References

Abramowitz, Susan and Rasmussen, Roger. The effects of program size or program organization and management. Unpublished manuscript.

Adams, Michael, et al. Educational Perspectives. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976.

Almond, G. A. and Verba, S. The Civic Culture. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1965.

Alutto, Joseph A. and Belasco, James A. A typology for participation in organizational decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1), March 1972, pp. 117-125.

Anderson, James G. Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1968.

Andrew, Michael D. Teacher Leadership: A Model for Change. Washington, D. C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1974.

Blumberg, Paul. Industrial Democracy. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.

Braverman, Harry. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Bredo, Anneke E. and Bredo, Eric R. A Case Study of Educational Innovation in a Junior High School: Interaction of Environment and Structure. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1975.

Bridges, Edwin M. Teacher participation in decision making. Administrator's Notebook, 12 (9), May 1964.

Bridges, Edwin M., Doyle, Wayne J., and Mahan, David J. Effects of hierarchical differentiation on group productivity, efficiency, and risk taking. Administrative Science Quarterly, 13 (2), September 1968, pp. 305-319.

Bruno, James E. and Nottingham, M. A. Collegial Teams. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976.

California State Department of Education. Interim report on the special study of selected ECE schools with increasing and decreasing reading scores. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1977.

Carpenter, Harrell H. Formal organizational structural factors and perceived job satisfaction of classroom teachers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (4), December 1971, pp. 460-465.

Clark, Woodrow W. Defining involvement into participation. Unpublished manuscript, 1977.

Cohen, Elizabeth G. Problems and Prospects of Teaming. Research and Development Memorandum No. 143. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

Cohen, Elizabeth G., Intili, Jo-Ann K., and Robbins, Susan H. Task and authority: a sociological view of classroom management. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Classroom Management. The seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Cohen, Michael D., March, James G., and Olsen, Johan P. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1), March 1972, pp. 1-25.

Conway, James A. Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1), March 1976, pp. 130-139.

Coons, John E. and Sugerman, Stephen D. Education by Choice. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Corwin, Ronald G. Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

David, Miriam E. School Rule: A Case Study of Participation in Budgeting in America. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1975.

Davies, Don, et al. Sharing the Power? A Report on the Status of School Councils in the 1970's. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, undated.

Deal, Terrance E., Intili, Jo-Ann, Rosaler, Jean A., and Stackhouse, Ann. The Early Childhood Education Program: An Assessment of Its Impact and Implementation. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1977.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. and Scott, W. Richard. Evaluation and Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975.

Doyle, Walter. Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Classroom Management. The seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Duckworth, Kenneth and Jovick, Thomas. Task interdependence, communication, and team management among elementary school teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978.

Duke, Daniel L. Adults can be discipline problems too! Psychology in the Schools, 15 (4), October 1978, pp. 522-528. (a)

_____. Developing a comprehensive in-service program. NASSP Bulletin, 61 (408), April 1977, pp. 66-71. (a)

_____. Environmental influences on classroom management. In Daniel L. Duke (ed.), Classroom Management. The seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

_____. The Retransformation of the School. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978. (a)

_____. A systematic management plan for school discipline. NASSP Bulletin, 61 (405), January 1977, pp. 1-10. (b)

_____. Toward responsible innovation. The Educational Forum, 42 (3), March 1978, pp. 351-372. (b)

Duke, Daniel L., Donmoyer, Robert, and Farman, Greg. Emerging legal issues related to classroom management. Phi Delta Kappan, 60 (4), December 1978, pp. 305-309.

Duke, Daniel L. and Muzio, Irene A. How effective are alternative schools? -- a review of recent evaluations and reports. Teachers College Record, 79 (3), February 1978, pp. 461-483.

Duke, Daniel L. and Perry, Cheryl. Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner have failed? Adolescence, Vol. XIII No. 51, Fall 1978.

Duke, Daniel L., Showers, Beverly K., and Imber, Michael. Teacher involvement in organizational decision making: a research proposal. Stanford, unpublished research proposal, 1978.

_____. Teachers and shared decision making: the costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (1), Winter 1980.

Emrick, John A. and Peterson, Susan M. Final report: follow-up evaluation of the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project. Los Altos, Calif.: John A. Emrick & Associates, 1978.

Far West Teacher Corps Network. Inservice Education: Criteria for Local Programs. Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington State College, 1976.

Floden, Robert E. A policy capturing study of teacher decisions about content. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978. (a)

_____. Teacher autonomy and the control of content taught. East Lansing: unpublished research proposal, 1978. (b)

Francis, Paul. Beyond Control? A Study of Discipline in the Comprehensive School. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1975.

Francke, Donald C. The assessment and improvement of organizational understanding. The Journal of Experimental Education, 36 (2), Winter 1967, pp. 59-63.

Galbraith, Jay R. Organization Design. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.

Garms, Walter I., Guthrie, James W., and Pierce, Lawrence C. School Finance. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Goode, Wailliam J. The Celebration of Heroes: Prestige as a Control System. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Greene, Maxine. Teaching: the question of personal reality. Teachers College Record, 80 (1), September 1978, pp. 23-35.

Hagberg, Hilma, et al. The Work-Study Team: A Model for Collaboration between School and University. Occasional paper no. 19. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1977.

Halpin, A. W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Hanson, E. Mark. Organizational control in educational systems: a case study of governance in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978.

House, Ernest R. and Lapan, Stephen D. Survival in the Classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Iannaccone, Laurence. An approach to the informal organization of the school. In Daniel E. Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. The sixty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Imber, Michael. Teacher power and curriculum: a potential for reform. Unpublished manuscript.

Ivins, Molly. A radical plan puts everybody in charge. New York Times, March 20, 1979, p. C1.

Janis, Irving L. Victims of Groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Janis, Irving L. and Mann, Leon. Decision Making. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Johnson, Rudolph. The Relationship between Teacher Collaboration and Teacher and Principal Influence and Participation in School Decision Making. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Joyce, Bruce R., et al. Issues to Face. Inservice Teacher Education Report I. Palo Alto: Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project, 1976.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations, Second Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Kirst, Michael W. Coalition building for school finance reform: the case of California. Journal of Education Finance, 4, Summer 1978, pp. 29-45.

Kirst, Michael W. and Walker, Decker F. An analysis of curriculum policy-making. Review of Educational Research, 41 (5), December 1971, pp. 479-509.

Klein, Lisl. New Forms of Work Organization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Kornhauser, W. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Krajewski, Robert J. Secondary principals want to be instructional leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 60 (1), September 1978, p. 65.

Krasnow, Bernard. What kind of principal do teachers want? Phi Delta Kappan, 60 (2), October 1978, p. 137.

Kunz, Daniel W. and Hoy, Wayne K. Leadership style of principals and the professional zone of acceptance of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12 (3), Fall 1976, pp. 49-64.

Levin, Henry M. Workplace Democracy and Educational Planning. Palo Alto: Center for Economic Studies, 1978.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

March, James G. and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

March, James G. and Olsen, Johan P. Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

Marram, Gwen D., Dornbusch, Sanford M., and Scott, W. Richard. The Impact of Teaming and the Visibility of Teaching on the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers. Technical Report No. 33. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972.

McConahay, John B., et al. Evaluation of High School in the Community: New Haven, Connecticut, 1973. New Haven: Educational Research Service, 1973.

McCosh, Andrew M and Morton, Michael S. Scott. Management Decision Support Systems. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

McDonald, Frederick J. Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Phase II, 1973-74: Executive Summary Report. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin and Marsh, David D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 80 (1), September 1978, pp. 69-94.

Meyer, John and Cohen, Elizabeth. The Impact of the Open-Space School upon Teacher Influence and Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational Innovation. Technical Report No. 21. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1971.

Meyer, John W. and Rowan, Brian. Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83 (2), September 1977, pp. 340-363.

Moeller, Gerald H. Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power. The School Review, 72 (2), Summer 1964, pp. 137-157.

Mohrman, Allan M. , Cooke, Robert A., and Mohrman, Susan Albers. Participation in decision making: a multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), Winter 1978, pp. 13-29.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and McConnell, T. R. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Mulder, Mauk. Power equalization through participation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (1), March 1971, pp. 31-38.

Myers, Donald A. Teacher Power. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

National Institute of Education. Instructional Personnel Utilization. National Conference on Studies in Teaching. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

_____. Violent Schools -- Safe Schools. The Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Volume I. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

National School Public Relations Association. Differentiated Staffing in Schools. Washington, D. C.: NSPRA, 1970.

Nickse, Ruth S. Teachers As Change Agents. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1977.

Oberg, Antionette Alexander. Information Referents and Patterns in the Curriculum Planning of Classroom Teaching. Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1975.

Parker, Thomas A. A Study of the Effect of Collective Bargaining Upon the Authority of the Principal in Secondary Schools in Illinois. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1976.

Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Pellegrin, Roland J. Schools as Work Settings. In Robert Dubin (ed.), Handbook of Work, Organization and Society (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1976).

Peterson, Paul E. Institutionalizing a social movement: problems in the governance of teacher centers. In Sharon Feiman (ed.), Teacher Centers: What Place in Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago, Center for Policy Study, 1978.

Roper, Susan Stavert, Deal, Terrence E., and Dornbusch, Sanford M. A Pilot Test of Collegial Evaluation for Teachers. Research and Development Memorandum No. 142. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

Rosenthal, Alan. Pedogogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969.

San Jose Teachers Association. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project. San Jose: San Jose Teacher Involvement Project, 1977.

Sarason, Seymour. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Schiffer, Judith. A framework for staff development. Teachers College Record, 80 (1), September 1978, pp. 4-22.

Schlechty, Phillip C. Teaching and Social Behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Schmuck, Patricia, Paddock, Susan, and Packard, John. Management Implications of Team Teaching. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Organizational Policy and Management, 1977.

Scott, W. Richard. Professionals in bureaucracies -- areas of conflict. In Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills (eds.), Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Shavelson, Richard J. Teachers' decision making. In N. L. Gage (ed.), The Psychology of Teaching Methods. The seventy-fifth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Shulman, Lee S. and Elstein, Arthur S. Studies of problem solving, judgment, and decision making: implications for educational research. In Fred N. Kerlinger (ed.), Review of Research in Education, Volume 3. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1945.

_____. A behavioral model of rational choice. In Nelson W. Polsby, Robert A. Dentler, and Paul A. Smith (eds.), Politics and Social Life: An Introduction to Political Behavior. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

_____. The New Science of Management Decision. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Speiker, Charles A. Curriculum Leaders: Improving Their Influence. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976.

Spillane, Robert R. and Levenson, Dorothy. Teacher training: a question of control, not content. Phi Delta Kappan, 57 (7), March 1976, pp. 435-439.

Stephens, Jo. Some current issues for teacher in-service education. In Elizabeth Adams (ed.), In-service Education for Teachers' Centers. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1975.

Sugarman, Stephen D. Education reform at the margin: two ideas. Phi Delta Kappan, 59 (3), November 1977, pp. 154-157.

Thomas, Margaret A. A Study of Alternatives in American Education, Vol. II: The Role of the Principal. Santa Monica, CA.: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

Walker, Decker F. How does a curriculum work? Unpublished manuscript, 1977.

_____. A naturalistic model for curriculum development. School Review, 80 (1), November 1971, pp. 51-65.

_____. Toward comprehension of curricular realities. In Lee S. Shulman (ed.), Review of Research in Education, Volume 4. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1976.

Watson, Vincent and Clark, Woodrow W. An alternative to chaos: let teachers decide. Unpublished manuscript.

Wise, Arthur E. Why educational policies often fail: the hyperrationalization hypothesis. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 9 (1), 1977, pp. 43-57.

Work in America, Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1973.

Yarger, Sam J., et al. Creative Authority and Collaboration. Inservice Teacher Education Report IV. Palo Alto: Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project, June 1976.

Zax, M. and Cowen, E. L. Early identification and prevention of emotional disturbance in a public school. In E. L. Cowen, E. A. Gardner, and M. Zax (eds.), Emergent Approaches to Mental Health Problems. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Zigarmi, Patricia, Betz, Loren, and Jensen, Darrell. Teachers' preferences in and perceptions of in-service education. Educational Leadership, 34 (7(, April 1977, pp. 545-551.